

## Hanford Cleanup

---

### Comments

E-0017/001

We are very concerned with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) proposal to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford. We believe DOE has failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in its Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). We urge you not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Rather, we urge you to stick to your mission to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford and not to add any more contamination to this problem.

We believe the revised EIS human health and environmental impact analyses are lacking as follows:

- There should be a complete inventory and classification of all wastes before DOE can assess the impacts of adding even more waste to Hanford.
- There will be an increase in contaminated groundwater that flows to the Columbia River by dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste. If the groundwater is allowed to become contaminated, any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach will be eliminated.
- There is not an adequate assessment of risks to all communities along transportation routes.
- There is not actual timeline given for lining and monitoring the burial trenches for radioactive waste. These burial grounds must be lined immediately.
- The "no action" alternative considers stopping all cleanup at Hanford--that is not an alternative!

We don't understand why, when we are spending billions of dollars to clean up radioactive waste at Hanford, we would want to risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater. We request DOE reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on the faulty analyses contained in the revised EIS, which is still not responsive to citizen concerns. We urgently request DOE stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches.

EM-0001/001, EM-0002/001, EM-0003/001, EM-0004/001, EM-0005/001, EM-0006/001, EM-0007/001, EM-0008/001, EM-0009/001, EM-0010/001, EM-0011/001, EM-0012/001, EM-0013/001, EM-0014/001, EM-0015/001, EM-0016/001, EM-0017/001, EM-0018/001, EM-0019/001, EM-0020/001, EM-0021/001, EM-0022/001, EM-0023/001, EM-0024/001, EM-0025/001, EM-0026/001, EM-0027/001, EM-0028/001, EM-0029/001, EM-0030/001, EM-0031/001, EM-0032/001, EM-0033/001, EM-0034/001, EM-0035/001, EM-0036/001, EM-0037/001, EM-0038/001, EM-0039/001, EM-0040/001, EM-0041/001, EM-0042/001, EM-0043/001, EM-0044/001, EM-0045/001, EM-0046/001, EM-0047/001, EM-0048/001, EM-0049/001, EM-0050/001, EM-0051/001, EM-0052/001, EM-0053/001, EM-0054/001, EM-0055/001, EM-0056/001, EM-0057/001, EM-0058/001, EM-0059/001, EM-0060/001, EM-0061/001, EM-0062/001, EM-0063/001, EM-0064/001, EM-0065/001, EM-0066/001, EM-0067/001, EM-0068/001, EM-0069/001, EM-0070/001, EM-0071/001, EM-0072/001, EM-0073/001, EM-0074/001, EM-0075/001, EM-0076/001, EM-0077/001, EM-0078/001, EM-0079/001, EM-0080/001, EM-0081/001, EM-0082/001, EM-0083/001, EM-0084/001, EM-0085/001, EM-0086/001, EM-0087/001, EM-0088/001, EM-0089/001, EM-0090/001, EM-0091/001, EM-0092/001, EM-0093/001, EM-0094/001, EM-0095/001, EM-0096/001, EM-0097/001, EM-0098/001, EM-0099/001, EM-0100/001, EM-0101/001, EM-0102/001, EM-0103/001, EM-0104/001, EM-0105/001, EM-0106/001, EM-0107/001, EM-0108/001, EM-0109/001, EM-0110/001, EM-0111/001, EM-0112/001, EM-0113/001, EM-0114/001, EM-0115/001, EM-0116/001, EM-0117/001, EM-0118/001, EM-0119/001, EM-0120/001, EM-0121/001, EM-0122/001, EM-0123/001, EM-0124/001, EM-0125/001, EM-0126/001, EM-0127/001, EM-0128/001, EM-0129/001, EM-0130/001, EM-0131/001, EM-0132/001, EM-0133/001, EM-0134/001, EM-0135/001, EM-0136/001, EM-0137/001, EM-0138/001, EM-0139/001, EM-0140/001,

## Hanford Cleanup

EM-0141/001, EM-0142/001, EM-0143/001, EM-0144/001, EM-0145/001, EM-0146/001, EM-0147/001, EM-0148/001, EM-0149/001, EM-0150/001, EM-0151/001, EM-0152/001, EM-0153/001, EM-0154/001, EM-0155/001, EM-0156/001, EM-0157/001, EM-0158/001, EM-0159/001, EM-0160/001, EM-0161/001, EM-0162/001, EM-0163/001, EM-0164/001, EM-0165/001, EM-0166/001, EM-0167/001, EM-0168/001, EM-0169/001, EM-0170/001, EM-0171/001, EM-0172/001, EM-0173/001, EM-0174/001, EM-0175/001, EM-0176/001, EM-0177/001, EM-0178/001, EM-0179/001, EM-0180/001, EM-0181/001, EM-0182/001, EM-0183/001, EM-0184/001, EM-0185/001, EM-0186/001, EM-0187/001, EM-0188/001, EM-0189/001, EM-0190/001, EM-0191/001, EM-0192/001, EM-0193/001, EM-0194/001, EM-0195/001, EM-0196/001, EM-0197/001, EM-0198/001, EM-0199/001, EM-0200/001, EM-0201/001, EM-0202/001, EM-0203/001, EM-0204/001, EM-0205/001, EM-0206/001, EM-0207/001, EM-0208/001, EM-0209/001, EM-0210/001, EM-0211/001, EM-0212/001, EM-0213/001, EM-0214/001, LM-0001/001, LM-0002/001, LM-0003/001, LM-0004/001

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination.

Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of on site Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

## Hanford Cleanup

EMM-0002/001

As a Northwestern resident who knows people who have been working on cleaning up Hanford, I want to encourage you to further the cleanup operations. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

EMM-0003/001

Please think of the future of our children, when making such long term decisions!

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I URGE you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, NOT to add more contamination to this problem.

## Hanford Cleanup

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

PLEASE consider future consequences in making your decisions.

EMM-0004/001

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

EMM-0005/001

Sustainability. Sustainability is essential to every decision we make in this interconnected world we live in. Nuclear energy is the antithesis of sustainability. It generates radioactive wastes with half lives that run hundreds of generations. Is this the legacy we want to leave our children? And their children hundreds of generations removed? The human race will be dealing with the fallout from our collective decisions regarding



## Hanford Cleanup

nuclear waste for a very long time. Understanding this, it is vitally important that our decisions are made with both eyes focused intently on the future. Half assed fixes will be dealt with again. And again. And again. Over and over again. Until we get it right. So let's make every effort to do it right this time.

Right now.

I am writing you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes."
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

EMM-0006/001

I use[d] to live in Richland, WA. All of my grandparents worked at Hanford. I am well aware of the problems associated with Hanford, the risks imposed upon the citizens of Washington, and the risk nuclear waste represents to the Columbia river ecosystem and the everything downstream to the Pacific Ocean. I urge the USDOE to cleanup the superfund site of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world.

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. We

## Hanford Cleanup

have not even fixed the problem of contaminated ground 20 feet away from the Columbia River. Why would we add to the problem before fixing it. I plead with you to first resolve the issue before adding to it.

Once again, The USDOE has failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose to NOT import any off site waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem. Fix the Super Fund site now. Don't freakin add to the problem. Who runs this show anyways?

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes."
- Your current "no action" alternative in your EIS considers something which is unacceptable -- stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

Remember, you are a government agency that works for the people. Not the Bush Administration's flawed Energy Policy created with the help of Enron. You don't work for Corporations. You work for the people, the citizens. Please do not consider the opinions of Corporations, as they do not have the right to vote and should not have any right to have an opinion at all in politics. As that would be anti-democracy. Please respect the peoples' comments and address each concern. I also urge you to accept all comments, whether they are unique comments or part of a mass mailing.

EMM-0007/001

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS).

I urge you to not import any off-site waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the ground, and potentially the Columbia River, at Hanford, not to add more contamination. Clean-up has been delayed many times and the cost has risen substantially. Washington citizens have already been harmed by radioactive releases from Hanford, and radioactive material has been

## Hanford Cleanup

detected in groundwater which will soon reach the Columbia River, if it has not already done so.

If a successful process for consolidating waste for permanent disposal, such as vitrification, can be developed, and the existing mess is cleaned up, that will be the time to consider importing new waste for processing, but not storage, at Hanford. However, I am also concerned about the risk to citizens that would occur by having trucks or trains transporting radioactive materials through Washington state. I have seen no evidence that this issue has been adequately addressed. Each load may increase the risk only slightly, but transporting many loads increases the risk of accident or terrorism substantially.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You need to complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial, and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches now.

EMM-0008/001

I recently received notice that the DOE is proposing to double the amount of waste buried in unlined trenches. I cannot believe that any additional waste is being allowed in unlined trenches. Even standard municipal solid waste dumps must be lined.

I live downstream from Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. As a sailboat racer on the Columbia river, I have a vested interest in keeping radionuclides out of the water. The Columbia river has enough problems without the DOE ignoring it's responsibility to the health of the river.

Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS).

I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this

## Hanford Cleanup

problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.
- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003.
- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers something which is unacceptable stopping all cleanup at Hanford.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

EMM-0009/001

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, effectively doubling the risk of soil and groundwater contamination. The Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS) on Hanford fails to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste. I urge you to choose not to import any additional offsite waste to Hanford. Our mission should be to clean up the radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS is inadequate in the following ways:

1. The cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford is not included. An inventory and classification of these wastes must be performed before we can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.
2. New radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” The analysis places the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Contaminating the groundwater at Hanford destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.

## Hanford Cleanup

3. Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
4. The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. However, it does not provide any timeline for achieving this.
5. Finally, the EIS does not specify an alternative to burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers something which is unacceptable—stopping all cleanup at Hanford.
6. We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup the Hanford radioactive mess. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? Please reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis.

EMM-0010/001

You, the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), are proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem. I am particularly concerned because I, and millions of other Washington and Oregon residents live downstream from Hanford and are subject to the contamination of the entire Columbia Basin ground water supply. This is serious business. Once the water supply is contaminated, we may never be able to clean it successfully.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radio-nuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.

Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for “thousands of years.” In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.

Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”

The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this. I want these burial grounds to be lined by the end of 2003!

Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current “no action” alternative considers stopping all cleanup at Hanford – this is unacceptable!

We are spending billions of dollars cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater?

I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty

## Hanford Cleanup

analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

L-0042/001

I'm tired of getting jacked-around by bureaucrats! How about pretending that Washington State is your home and treating us the way you would like to be treated? We don't want anymore nuclear waste. Washington State did its' share while the U.S. was developing nuclear weapons and we deserve some consideration now.

I am writing to you as a citizen concerned with the cleanup of Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. You, the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), are proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

- You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radionuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. You must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford.

- Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.

- Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes."

- The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this, yet these burial grounds should be lined by the end of 2003!

- Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of on site Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers stopping all cleanup at Hanford - this is unacceptable.

We are spending billions of dollars to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? I ask again that you reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive enough to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches by the end of 2003.

L-0046/001

The U.S. Department of Energy's (USDOE) proposal to double the amount of radioactive waste buried at Hanford presents a grave threat of radioactive contamination to the Columbia River and all the land adjacent to it including the National Scenic Area. Because the waste will likely be stored in unlined disposal pits, the



## Hanford Cleanup

risk of more soil and groundwater contamination is greatly increased.

The Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) fails to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of shipping additional waste to Hanford. Because the DOE has not yet cleaned up the existing radioactive contamination at Hanford, additional radioactive waste should not be sent to Hanford. The EIS must address the cumulative impacts of shipping more waste to the Hanford site. A cumulative impacts analysis must consider the past, present, and likely future efforts to control the contamination at Hanford. In addition, the analysis should address the following issues:

- The EIS must consider the long half-life of radio-nuclides such as iodine-129, which are stored in large quantities at Hanford. The DOE must complete the inventory and classification of these wastes before it can assess the impacts of adding more waste at Hanford.
- The EIS must consider the impacts additional hazardous waste might have on water quality in the immediate vicinity of Hanford Reach. The latest EIS masks the impact of ground and surface water contamination by only considering water quality miles downriver from Hanford.
- The EIS fails to adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous “transuranic wastes.”
- The EIS fails to provide a timeline that states specific deadlines for the lining of hazardous waste dumpsites and contaminated areas. These sites must be lined immediately.
- The no-action alternative must not use as a baseline comparison the notion that all on-site mitigation will cease if the proposed alternatives are not implemented. Such a notion creates a false choice between cleanup and no cleanup.

Because the multi-billion-dollar effort to clean up the Hanford waste site is not complete, the DOE's plan to ship additional waste to the site will undermine current cleanup efforts and drain scarce budgetary resources from the currently inadequate cleanup fund. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives.

LMM-0001/001

We are writing you as citizens who live downriver from Hanford, one of the most contaminated places in the world. Right now, you, the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), are proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford. This would double the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination, and this at a place that is supposedly being cleaned up. In fact, billions of dollars are being spent on this supposed cleanup. All of this will be wasted and our River, the air around Hanford, in fact, possibly the entire area will be radioactively polluted if more is dumped into the unlined pits at Hanford. How on earth can this be considered within any realm of conscience?

Once again, you have failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in your Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS). There is simply no valid reason to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

The analysis of human health and environmental impacts in this revised SW EIS still fails in several ways:

You do not include in your cumulative risk analysis many of the long-lived radio-nuclides, such as iodine-129, that occur in significant quantities at Hanford. This inventory and the classification of these wastes must be completed before you can assess the impacts of adding more waste to Hanford. In fact, it is not necessary to complete the inventory and classification to fully understand the horribly negative impact of such dumping

## Hanford Cleanup

at the Hanford site.

Dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste will increase contamination groundwater flowing towards the Columbia River for "thousands of years." In your impact analysis, you have placed the point of compliance for groundwater at the Columbia River, miles away from the burial grounds, in order to meet drinking water standards. Allowing the groundwater to become contaminated destroys any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach.

Transporting nuclear waste to Hanford creates unnecessary risks to human and environmental health in Washington and Oregon, and along the entire route between current storage and Hanford. The new EIS still does not adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from dangerous "transuranic wastes."

The SW EIS contains several alternatives to line and monitor the burial trenches for radioactive waste. You do not provide any timeline for achieving this. I want these burial grounds to be lined by the end of 2003!

Finally, you still do not provide an alternative in your EIS that would only assess burial of onsite Hanford cleanup waste. Your current "no action" alternative considers stopping all cleanup at Hanford - this is unacceptable!

We are spending billions of dollars cleanup the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater? You must reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on a faulty analysis. The Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement is still not responsive to citizen concerns and does not effectively analyze all alternatives. I request that you stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches.

### Response

DOE is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. As of February 1, 2003, DOE had met 99% of its TPA milestones on or ahead of schedule. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. See Volume III Section 2, Item 6 of the CRD for more examples of cleanup at Hanford.

Hanford is part of a nationwide cleanup effort of over 100 DOE sites and cooperates with these sites in the cleanup. As part of that effort, Hanford would receive some LLW, MLLW, and would temporarily store some TRU waste from other DOE sites, as well as send HLW, spent nuclear fuel, and TRU waste to other DOE sites. The HSW EIS evaluates a range of waste receipts at Hanford to encompass the uncertainties regarding quantities of waste that would ultimately be managed at the site. The waste volumes evaluated include a Lower Bound waste volume consisting mainly of Hanford waste, and an Upper Bound volume that includes additional quantities of offsite waste that Hanford might receive consistent with WM PEIS decisions. The HSW EIS includes an evaluation of Hanford-only and "no import of out of state waste" waste volumes. These provide a basis with which to determine the impacts of varying quantities of offsite waste at Hanford.

## Hanford Cleanup

The HSW EIS No Action Alternative provides a baseline for comparison of the impacts from the proposed action and alternatives and is consistent with decisions reached under previous NEPA reviews. No Action thus reflects the current status quo and continued operation of existing facilities without conducting additional activities necessary to meet regulatory obligations. The HSW EIS No Action Alternative would only partially meet DOE's obligations under the Hanford TPA and applicable regulatory requirements. As such it represents an analytical construct to meet NEPA requirements rather than an expression of DOE's intended future actions. Because most activities considered in the HSW EIS are ongoing operations, or have been the subject of previous decisions made under other NEPA reviews, the No Action Alternative consists of implementing the previous NEPA decisions or of continuing current solid waste management practices, consistent with CEQ guidance. The No Action Alternative was evaluated using the Hanford Only waste volume and the Lower Bound waste volume. The No Action Alternative for disposal of ILAW consists of the preferred alternative selected previously in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) EIS (62 FR 8693). The ILAW volume reflects a different waste form (cullet in canisters) than that assumed for Alternative Groups A through E (monolithic vitrified waste in canisters). See Volume I Section 3.1. Evaluations in the WM PEIS, the HSW EIS, and related NEPA documents indicate that additional wastes could be handled at Hanford without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.

The preferred alternative (Volume I, Section 3.7) is to dispose of LLW in newly constructed lined disposal facilities as soon as they are available. For purposes of analysis the HSW EIS assumes this would occur by 2007. All MLLW is currently, and will continue to be, disposed of in lined facilities. However, the use of unlined trenches for disposal of LLW is an established, legal, and environmentally protective method of low level waste disposal at both DOE and commercial facilities. As such, it is a reasonable alternative, under CEQ regulations, and must be analyzed. The HSW EIS considers a wide range of alternatives for disposal of LLW in both lined and unlined facilities. Lined trench alternatives include leak detection and leachate collection capabilities. In addition, groundwater monitoring would be done in compliance with applicable RCRA and State hazardous waste, TPA, and DOE requirements to validate the performance of the disposal facilities.

The maximum point of impact from multiple and widely dispersed sources may not necessarily be directly underneath the Low Level Burial Grounds or at the Low Level Burial Ground boundary. To model the groundwater impacts from multiple and widely dispersed disposal units over long periods of time, a 1-km point of analysis location was deemed to be more appropriate and representative than a regulatory point of compliance well location, for purposes of NEPA analysis. The point of analysis approach is considered technically appropriate for a NEPA evaluation of groundwater impacts over the long-term (10,000 years) time period analyzed. The 1-km point of analysis is not intended to represent the proposed locations for actual monitoring wells that would be used during the operational and closure time period. Groundwater impacts at the facility boundary (about 100 meters) have been added to the impacts identified for the preferred alternative and a qualitative discussion is provided for the other alternatives. A discussion of the differences between the 1-km point of analysis and the disposal facility boundary is provided in Volume I, Section 5.3 and Volume II, Appendix G.

DOE believes that transportation impacts were properly analyzed in previous NEPA documents. However, in response to public comments, DOE has conducted a route- and generator-specific offsite transportation analysis using updated highway routing and 2000 census data. See Volume I, Section 5.8 and Volume II Appendix H. The potential impacts identified in the updated evaluation are similar to those presented in the WM PEIS and the WIPP SEIS-II, and would not change conclusions or DOE-wide waste management decisions based on those studies.

The HSW EIS uses the definition of cumulative impact as defined by the CEQ Regulations (40 CFR 1508.7): "Cumulative impact" is the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action

## Hanford Cleanup

when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. Potential cumulative impacts associated with implementing the HSW EIS alternative groups are summarized in Volume I Section 5.14. Past, current, and future Hanford activities include treatment and disposal of tank waste, CERCLA remediation projects, previously disposed of waste, decontamination and decommissioning of the Hanford production reactors and other facilities, waste in the PUREX tunnels, operation of a commercial LLW disposal facility by U.S. Ecology, and operation of the Columbia Generating Station by Energy Northwest. Cumulative impacts of storage, treatment, and disposal activities for a range of waste volumes are evaluated and expanded in the final HSW EIS. For most resource and potential impact areas, the combined effects from the alternative groups for the Hanford Only, Lower Bound and Upper Bound waste volumes, or for the No Action Alternative for the Hanford Only and Lower Bound waste volumes, when added to the impacts of these other activities, are small.

The HSW EIS evaluates impacts to the Columbia River and downstream populations for about 10,000 years. For all alternatives analyzed in this HSW EIS, DOE has analyzed the long-term movement of contaminants through soil and groundwater to the Columbia River. In all cases, it found that the water quality of the Columbia River would be virtually indistinguishable from the current river background levels. The concentrations of all the constituent contaminants were well below benchmark drinking water standards at a hypothetical well located near the Columbia River. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Volume I Sections 5.3 and Volume II Appendix G. See also Volume I Section 5.11 and 5.14 and Volume II Appendixes F and L.

The purpose of an EIS is to analyze and disclose the future consequences of a proposed action and its reasonable alternatives thereby providing environmental input into the final decision regarding the action.

DOE has sought input from regulatory agencies, Tribal Nations, and members of the public on the revised draft HSW EIS. DOE public involvement efforts have been conducted in accordance with applicable NEPA requirements

---

---

### Comments

E-0055/010

USDOE is required by NEPA to integrate all related Hanford specific Environmental Restoration and Waste Management actions into a Hanford Sitewide EIS to determine the cumulative impacts from the wastes that already exist at Hanford, and all proposed Hanford cleanup actions and decisions. Only after the aggregate risks and impacts from all Hanford site wastes, and proposed actions for Hanford wastes, are known, can DOE analyze the impacts of adding additional off-site wastes (and facilities for treating, storing and disposing of those wastes).

DOE committed in the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (WM PEIS) to a sitewide NEPA review for site impacts in implementing the decisions under the PEIS. The HSW EIS fails to analyze all of the site level impacts and hence is not the sitewide analysis as DOE committed to.

USDOE is legally required to present the actual conditions in the Hanford burial grounds, waste release sites and facilities, and analyze the impacts of those conditions on human health and the environment. The revised draft Hanford Solid Waste EIS totally fails to present the actual conditions, and the risks from those conditions. NEPA requires that alternatives for cleanup and mitigation or elimination of those risks be presented in this EIS.

L-0062/003

We [Hanford Communities] are concerned, however, that information in the document is still inadequate to support any decision to permanently dispose of additional off-site waste at Hanford. In our letter to you dated

## Hanford Cleanup

September 24, 2002; we stated: “we believe that the EIS should evaluate the extent and characteristics of waste and contamination already in the ground, including CERCLA [Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act] waste that will remain at Hanford. It should include information and analysis of groundwater contamination and movement as it relates to existing waste and projected waste disposal.” We stated our expectation that the document would provide “a thorough analysis of the environmental consequences of waste currently buried at Hanford and analyze the incremental impact of waste coming from other sites.”

We, like others in the region, expected this document to provide a cumulative analysis of the risks posed by Hanford and offsite waste that will remain at the site. We also expected an analysis of the holding capacity of the land so that we can be assured that permanent disposal of off-site waste will provide no environmental consequences to this region. It is extremely important to residents of the region[,] businesses[,] and individuals considering relocating to the area that adequate scientific analysis has been done. This is necessary to assure that the disposal of waste from on- and off-site does not pose a threat to the environment and the health of people in this region.

### Response

The HSW EIS evaluates the consequences of various site-specific alternatives to the ongoing waste management program at Hanford, consistent with WM PEIS (DOE 1997b) decisions regarding certain TRU waste, LLW, and MLLW streams. Site-specific waste management actions at Hanford involve transportation, treatment and processing of TRU waste and MLLW, disposal of LLW, MLLW and ILAW, and storage of LLW, MLLW, and TRU waste. A discussion of the WM PEIS and other NEPA review documents relevant to the HSW EIS can be found in Volume I Section 1.5.

The WM PEIS was a comprehensive evaluation of DOE nationwide waste management. The WM PEIS evaluated a broad suite of alternatives for waste management across the DOE complex, including managing most waste at generator facilities, or consolidating waste management at fewer sites that have existing facilities suitable to accept waste from other facilities. The impacts of those alternatives were compared for a variety of waste volumes at different DOE sites, including larger quantities of waste than are evaluated in the HSW EIS. The general result of the WM PEIS was that radioactive and hazardous wastes generated at a DOE site should be disposed of at that site unless the site was not capable of or not technically able to support those actions. DOE determined there was sufficient information in the WM PEIS to support decisions regarding the sites that were suitable for long-term waste management missions. Those decisions included processing and disposing of Hanford waste at Hanford, and the importation of wastes from other sites that could not adequately handle them. Decisions made as part of the WM PEIS made Hanford available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from other DOE generators. The initial WM PEIS decisions related to LLW, MLLW, and TRU waste were issued between January 1998 and February 2000.

Hanford is part of a nationwide cleanup effort of over 100 DOE sites and cooperates with these sites in the cleanup. As part of that effort, Hanford would receive some LLW, MLLW, and would temporarily store some TRU waste from other DOE sites, as well as send HLW, spent nuclear fuel, and TRU waste to other DOE sites. The HSW EIS evaluates a range of waste receipts at Hanford to encompass the uncertainties regarding quantities of waste that would ultimately be managed at the site. The waste volumes evaluated include a Lower Bound waste volume consisting mainly of Hanford waste, and an Upper Bound volume that includes additional quantities of offsite waste that Hanford might receive consistent with WM PEIS decisions. The HSW EIS includes an evaluation of Hanford Only waste. The Hanford waste evaluation provides a basis with which to determine the impacts of varying quantities of offsite waste at Hanford. Evaluations in the WM PEIS, the HSW EIS, and related NEPA documents indicate that additional wastes could be handled at Hanford without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste has been revised and is presented in Volume I Section 5.8 and Volume II Appendix H.

The HSW EIS uses the definition of cumulative impact as defined by the CEQ Regulations (40 CFR 1508.7):

## Hanford Cleanup

“Cumulative impact” is the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. Potential cumulative impacts associated with implementing the HSW EIS alternative groups are summarized in Volume I Section 5.14. Past, current, and future Hanford activities include treatment and disposal of tank waste, CERCLA remediation projects, previously disposed of waste, decontamination and decommissioning of the Hanford production reactors and other facilities, waste in the PUREX tunnels, operation of a commercial LLW disposal facility by U.S. Ecology, and operation of the Columbia Generating Station by Energy Northwest. Cumulative impacts of storage, treatment, and disposal activities for a range of waste volumes are evaluated and expanded in the final HSW EIS. For most resource and potential impact areas, the combined effects from the alternative groups for the Hanford Only, Lower Bound and Upper Bound waste volumes, or for the No Action Alternative for the Hanford Only and Lower Bound waste volumes, when added to the impacts of these other activities, are small.

An expanded discussion of potential mitigation measures is in Volume I Section 5.18.

---

---

### Comments

F-0022/002

In connection to this cleanup report, I would like to have a contract in the draft that promises and abides to bi-annual reports of the clean-up procedures that have occurred.

### Response

DOE is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. As of February 1, 2003, DOE had met 99% of its TPA milestones on or ahead of schedule. Extensive information is available to the public and regulators through TPA public information programs, administrative record, websites, and reading rooms.

---

---

### Comments

L-0043/002

[The] USDOE is in violation today of the Tri-Party Agreement, by its refusal to provide basic information, essential to crucial cleanup of Hanford.

### Response

DOE is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. As of February 1, 2003, DOE had met 99% of its TPA milestones on or ahead of schedule. Extensive information is available to the public and regulators through TPA public information programs, administrative record, websites, and reading rooms.

DOE believes this HSW EIS complies with applicable NEPA requirements.

---

---

### Comments

E-0001/001

Please stop any further importation of offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem. And please do not let it be moved through Portland, where any number of disasters could happen.



## Hanford Cleanup

E-0002/001

Do not let more shipments of radioactive waste come to Hanford. It is not capable of taking these shipments.

E-0003/001

First, the nuclear waste and pollution that already exists, hasn't been dealt with at Hanford yet to my satisfaction.

E-0004/001

I am a concerned citizen, and I am writing this in an effort to get Hanford to stop the importation of radioactive waste.

E-0005/001

I am writing to express my concern over the shipping of nuclear waste for dumping at the Hanford site. I ask that you stop this practice until further studies can be completed.

E-0006/002

PLEASE do not import any offsite waste to Hanford. The radioactive mess needs to be cleaned up as its already contaminating the Columbia River. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater?

E-0007/001

No more importation of radioactive waste to Hanford!

E-0008/003

I feel distressed when I hear that the government is wanting to (and probably has) brought more radioactive materials to Hanford. I thought the goal was to clean it all up and return the NW USA to health and safety.

E-0009/001

I am writing to express my GREAT concern about the Hanford Clean up site and news of further contamination by accepting more nuclear waste from other locations.

E-0010/001

The US DOE is proposing a doubling of the amount of waste stored at Hanford; this is completely unacceptable. Why, in an area that continues to absorb billions of dollars in taxpayer money for cleanup, would we want to add MORE nuclear/chemical waste?

E-0010/002

Enforce and follow the guidelines/goals previously established for cleanup of the site.

E-0011/001

I am adamantly opposed to adding more radioactive waste to Hanford. This is ridiculous, given the amazing cleanup task ahead of us with what we have now.

E-0012/001

I urge you to choose not to import any off-site waste to Hanford.

E-0012/005

PLEASE. NO import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial.

E-0015/001

I cannot attend the meeting Tuesday evening, but would like to register my opinion against the dumping of further radioactive materials at Hanford. The water of the Columbia Basin is already in danger of extreme contamination, it makes little sense to increase that danger. Please see that not only the proposed dumping does not take place, but that the existing mess is cleaned up.

## Hanford Cleanup

E-0016/001

As a citizen of Washington State I want to protest the idea of sending any more radioactive waste to Hanford. The D.O.E. needs to live up to the tri-party agreement first of all, and protect the soil and water from the waste that is already there.

E-0020/001

I cannot imagine why and how it is even being considered to have more radioactive waste delivered to Hanford. This site is already the most contaminated site in our nation. And has been for quite some time! Please put a stop to this and let's clean up Hanford first.

E-0021/001

I do not think we should be accepting any additional wastes until what is already at Hanford is cleaned up and stored safely.

E-0022/001

I am deeply distressed by the state of the Hanford nuclear waste dump. I am also appalled by the plans the DOE has to import even more--70,000 truckloads of nuclear waste--to the Hanford storage site.

E-0022/003

Clean up Hanford!

E-0024/001

I've just found out more about the DOE's continuing plans to store nuclear waste at Hanford. It seems to me that Hanford has enough problems with its own cleanup - which continues to be stalled. I understand that a judge has at least temporarily stopped the storage, but it's not the final word.

E-0024/002

Please do whatever you can to STOP any further storage at Hanford, and push continued cleanup there.

E-0024/003

We've already been shown that carelessness is common and I see no reason why I should assume it will get any better. It doesn't take a genius to see that, with the Columbia River so near, and with the contamination that's already occurring, we don't need further dumping.

E-0026/003

Hanford is more than just a nuclear waste disposal location. It is a permanent reminder for generations to come of human irresponsibility, lack of forethought and planning AND most importantly lack of responsibility to clean up the messes we have created. The end result is the long-term poisoning of life and water sources within two states and hundreds of mile radius. This is a reality that must change.

E-0028/001

I strongly do not want waste from other states being sent to Hanford and/or any other locations in our state, Washington.

E-0032/001

I am heartily opposed to the DOE plan for bringing in more waste into Hanford. There is substantial waste there today, which needs to be cleaned up and properly treated and stored. The Columbia River and the area around Hanford are already at grave risk. We do not need more waste, we do need more cleanup.

E-0033/001

Please stop further import of radioactive waste.

E-0035/002

I can't help but be confused by how this plan contributes to the ongoing cleanup at Hanford. I wonder why we can't take care of our outstanding problems at Hanford before adding to them. If the truth is that there is no

## Hanford Cleanup

intent to ever clean up Hanford please make this clear. If we're willing to sacrifice the Columbia River as part of the Northwest's contribution to the national welfare, someone needs to simply say so, so the people have an opportunity to comment on these plans.

E-0036/001

I urge you as a concerned citizen of the State of Washington to put an immediate stop to further import of radioactive waste to Hanford!

E-0037/001

I am emailing you to voice my concerns about the planned shipment of 70,000 truckloads of waste to Hanford. I do not believe it makes sense to do this when the current waste is leaking into the soil and water table. I want the DOE to fulfill its previous commitments to clean up Hanford before it makes the situation even worse. If the DOE can clean up and vitrify the existing Hanford waste, I will have far less concern about shipping more waste. Until that time, I am most assuredly opposed to any action that involves shipping more waste to Hanford.

E-0038/001

It seems that in the past our country has often taken the easiest and least expensive approach to the clean up of radioactive and chemical waste. It's time for us to take a stand and show our country that we can store radioactive and chemical waste safely, that we can halt groundwater contamination, that we can stop transporting more radioactive waste until we can safely store our existing waste.

E-0039/001

Don't dump more waste in Hanford. It's already leaking.

E-0039/002

Cleanup must be our top priority.

E-0039/003

Cleanup is impossible if additional waste keeps increasing the problem.

E-0040/002

In addition, adding more nuclear waste at Hanford, a site that is not designed to house such refuse and is so close to the Columbia River a thriving ecosystem, is not an answer and poses more danger than solutions.

E-0042/001

I have been watching the developments in the Tri-Cities for years and am dismayed to learn that we could become, for real, the recipient of more toxic waste. Do you suppose it would be possible to clean up what is there in a responsible way first? And then maybe we could figure out if the Columbia River and the natural and human environment could safely receive more toxins.

E-0043/002, EM-0217/002, EM-0218/002, L-0056/002, LM-0017/002, LM-0018/002

As a policy matter, the Government Accountability Project [GAP] fundamentally objects to the Department of Energy's implicit view that the Hanford Site is the national government's nuclear trash can in the desert.

E-0043/003, EM-0217/003, EM-0218/003, L-0056/003, LM-0017/003, LM-0018/003

It is a gross understatement to state that Hanford is an environmental crisis in its own right, a public health menace of the first magnitude, and a gigantic dirty bomb ready to detonate over the populations of a three-state area.

E-0043/043, EM-0217/043, EM-0218/043, L-0056/043, LM-0017/043, LM-0018/043

In conclusion, the Hanford Site should be cleaned up and restored. This vision is not realized by dumping more waste and piling more radioactive and toxic junk on top of an already severely contaminated site.

## Hanford Cleanup

E-0043/045, EM-0217/045, EM-0218/045, L-0056/045, LM-0017/045, LM-0018/045

The DOE euphemistically refers to the Hanford Site as a "cleanup site," but the truth of the matter is writ large in these draft documents - DOE does not intend to clean up Hanford, but rather intends to dump even more waste there from around the country - and walk away.

E-0043/048, EM-0217/048, EM-0218/048, L-0056/048, LM-0017/048, LM-0018/048

Public comment on the PEIS reveals that the states, Tribes, and other stakeholders were dissatisfied with the analysis supporting the decision to select Hanford as a disposal site for imported waste.

E-0045/001

I am adamantly opposed to bringing more radioactive and hazardous waste into the Hanford Site. The current condition of the Hanford Site is unacceptable, and the proposed activities will add to the problem. Our attention should be focused on the clean-up of the existing environmental problems on site. Resources should be allocated for clean-up, not bringing in additional waste.

E-0047/040

For the reasons above and those articulated in a host of comments by other parties that we have reviewed, we believe DOE needs to issue yet another draft EIS. We recommend a Record of Decision for the disposal of radioactive waste at Hanford not be issued until the Tanks Retrieval and Closure EIS and its impacts are incorporated and all other deficiencies are incorporated.

While CRK does not make this request lightly, given DOE's efforts to adopt an aggressive program to ship additional waste to Hanford, failure to comply with NEPA and SEPA [State Environmental Policy Act] will only result in further delay and possible litigation.

E-0048/002

I do not think the Hanford Site Waste Program EIS describes a safe operation and I urge the Dept. of Energy to finish cleaning up Hanford without importing any new toxins.

E-0050/002

Primarily, I am interested in seeing that the current radioactive waste problem at Hanford is remedied.

E-0050/003

The current proposal, by bringing in more waste from off-site and doubling the amount of waste to be buried at Hanford, makes it likely that the current mess at Hanford will be aggravated rather than alleviated.

E-0051/002

The main issues then, as now, are the continued cuts in funding and a lack of emphasis on cleaning up Hanford's contaminated soil and water, and safely packaging and storing existing waste.

E-0051/007

Given the recent proposal to shut down the clean-up long before it actually is completed, coupled with Hanford clean-up budget cuts and the rapidly increasing federal deficit, I don't presently trust the Bush administration and by extension the DOE to do the right thing at Hanford.

E-0052/001

Please do not allow more radioactive waste to be imported to this state.

E-0052/002

Please abide by the Tri-Party agreement and clean up the mess!!!

EM-0215/001, EM-0216/001

We're writing to urge you to stop shipments of dangerous radioactive waste to Hanford. The focus needs to be on the cleanup of the dangerous nuclear waste stored there; the safety and security and the future of our state depend on it.

## Hanford Cleanup

EMM-0001/001

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) is proposing to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford, which doubles the risk of more soil and groundwater contamination. I urge you to choose not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem.

F-0001/002

We have already seen that the DOE cannot be trusted to clean up the Hanford site in a timely manner and that known leaks are going untended. If we can't trust DOE to store the waste safely, there is no reason to think that it can be trusted to transport the waste safely.

F-0001/003

I believe the waste that's at Hanford should be handled properly before we allow any further waste to come in and be added to it.

F-0003/001

We have been promised clean-up of the existing waste, for years. Now you want to add uncounted tons more waste from other sites, without finishing what you have already started.

F-0005/001

I do not support any additional nuclear waste shipments from anywhere to the Hanford site!

F-0005/002

I urge DOE to focus on effective clean-up efforts NOW!

F-0006/001

We the citizens, demand full accountability of clean-up @ Hanford before you accept any more dangerous toxic problematic waste material! Bringing more waste onto the Hanford Site will undoubtedly slow the clean-up process and will add more environmental burden on our groundwater to the Columbia River. Until these issues have been fully evaluated and shared with the public, additional off-site waste should be rejected.

F-0008/003

Hanford must be cleaned up - PERIOD. Accepting additional waste from other facilities is obviously not an answer. Transportation issues (if it comes to that - which it should not) must be more adequately addressed.

Groundwater is already being contaminated. We must be protected now and in the future.

F-0009/001

The waste at Hanford needs to be completely cleaned up before I would ever even consider allowing more waste moved to Hanford.

F-0009/003

Do not cut corners or rush the clean-up process.

F-0010/001

I still have grave concerns about moving new waste to Hanford. On the heels of decisions by the Department of Energy to halt large portions of its current cleanup efforts at the Hanford, it is obvious that we have our hands full disposing of the millions of gallons of high-level nuclear waste already at the site. Our first priority must be to remove the existing waste and treat it, so that it no longer threatens the citizens of the northwest, before we increase the amount of new waste being shipped to Hanford.

F-0011/003

DOE has promised to clean up the dangerous waste which already exists at Hanford and consistently refuses to do so.

## Hanford Cleanup

F-0011/006

Hanford already has excessive / more than its share of nuclear waste which is already not being properly processed.

F-0012/001

We the people of this region have asked for decades for a complete clean up of Hanford. Instead we have things like unlined trenches that can barely hold the waste for a few years let alone 1/4 million.

F-0012/003

The existing radioactive and toxic waste must be safely disposed of first before any waste may be brought in.

F-0014/003

I think that the consideration of accepting any new waste at Hanford is foolhardy. There is already an almost inconceivable amount of waste on the reservation that has not been dealt with (and in some cases, not identified), why accept more? Focus on cleanup.

F-0015/001, TSE-0014/001

Every president wants a legacy - and it seems that President Bush wants his legacy in Washington State to be enlarging our already dangerous Hanford Nuclear Reservation into the nation's toxic waste dump.

F-0015/007, TSE-0014/007

We believe that shipments to Hanford should end. The priority for the health of our people, fish and rivers is to safely contain the ever threatening toxic soup that sloshes around the Columbia Basin.

F-0015/008, TSE-0014/008

Focus this EIS on the effort to clean up what is already in the soil, rather than planning to add more to the nation's worst contaminated area.

F-0017/001

The Hanford mess is so horrific and inexcusable to begin with - that added to that the USDOE's horrific and inexcusable behavior in pretending to clean-up Hanford - it is nothing short of Domestic Terrorism!

F-0021/002

This is the cost of nuclear weapons and nuclear energy. The US Gov't can not shrink from real costs and try to skirt around the problem because our society, our river will be paying those costs for thousands and thousands of years.

F-0021/003

We only have one chance to get this right and we have to get it right, not quick, not cheap, but right.

F-0023/004

We do want Hanford and all other like areas in our country to be cleaned up to non-toxic (clean) levels in our lifetimes so we and our children and all the children, of all species, won't be afflicted with this kind of death.

F-0024/002

We want Hanford's dirty poisonous waste cleaned up - not just stored and quietly ignored.

F-0025/002

Worse yet, the incoming chemical and nuclear waste will likely put a halt to the ongoing cleanup work, long overdue at the Hanford Reserve.

F-0025/009

Our clean up dollars must come without more waste.



## Hanford Cleanup

F-0027/001

We believe Hanford needs to be cleaned up

F-0029/005

More importantly an actual commitment to clean-up at Hanford is needed.

F-0029/007

Clean up Hanford as well as possible ASAP!! No more wastes trucked to Hanford.

F-0029/010

Why have there been so many problems with contractors to clean up Hanford? Does this reflect poorly on the DOE? Bechtel Corp was fined \$3 million a while back for doing a poor job. Did they receive the contract because of political connection and not based on merit? How can we trust them to do a good job (and a fast job) when they have already messed up badly?

F-0030/006

It makes no sense to import further nuclear waste to Hanford; the only moral, safe, responsible thing to do is to do everything imaginable to clean up the dreadful, dangerous mess that is currently at the site before it ruins the magnificent Columbia River and kills everything downriver. And NOT to add further hazardous material to Hanford.

L-0001/001

I am concerned/opposed to nuclear waste being sent to Hanford. I understand Washington State is suing you for violations of agreements to clean up existing waste and not bring more in.

L-0001/002

Hanford is not appropriate for storage of this waste

L-0001/004

Now clean up Hanford.

L-0002/001

We want CLEAN UP AT HANFORD!.

L-0003/001

I am gravely concerned about the importation of transuranic waste to Hanford. I understand this was begun and has only been stopped by legal action by the State of Washington and Heart of America.

L-0003/002

WHEN WILL WASHINGTON STATE BE FREED FROM THAT THREAT TO OUR HEALTH AND OUR ENVIRONMENT?

L-0003/003

We want CLEAN UP[!]

L-0003/004

IT IS BEYOND COMPREHENSION THAT YOU WOULD BE DIGGING MORE AND BIGGGER TRENCHES TO ACCOMMODATE MORE WASTE[.]

L-0005/001

The current mission of Hanford is cleanup. More than doubling the total amount of radioactive and chemical waste, including deadly plutonium, is the very opposite of cleanup.

L-0006/001

I am against any further shipments of radioactive waste to the Hanford Nuclear site. This site is not

## Hanford Cleanup

adequately prepared to hold any more waste. It is also too dangerous to transport this type of waste on our nations highways.

L-0007/001

Cleanup for existing waste, which is already contaminating groundwater, has been designated as the current mission for the site, but progress has been excruciatingly slow. The proposal to add more waste will simply slow down cleanup even more while increasing the already existing threats to human and environmental health.

L-0008/001

I am alarmed that truckloads of radioactive and chemical waste are headed for Hanford.

Not one ounce of radioactive and chemical waste should go to Hanford until every bit already there is cleaned up. This is absolutely the highest priority to protect the health of those who live near.

This extreme danger to citizens of Oregon and Washington must be stopped.

L-0009/002

What we ask is that the present contamination be cleaned up so that the Columbia River will not be polluted.

L-0010/001

I am writing to encourage the Department of Energy not to go forward with the Hanford Solid Waste EIS. The current plan fails to adequately address the citizens' concerns. Dumping more radioactive waste at Hanford increases risk to human health and commerce by contaminating the Columbia River.

Please do not import more waste to Hanford.

L-0011/002

Waste storage is an issue that needs to be specifically addressed for the waste already on the site. Burying it in trenches and storage tanks that are subject to rotting out is not the answer.

L-0011/003

I believe that Hanford should continue to focus on the clean-up efforts that have been ongoing and find an environmentally sound method of waste disposal for the material on-site only. The facility is too close to the Columbia River and major population centers to risk bringing in additional waste from other sites. I strongly oppose transportation of any waste from off-site.

L-0012/007

We need to see more immediate progress in the cleanup of Hanford before we can carry the burdens from the rest of the nation.

L-0012/011

We insist on a quality cleanup, by our standards - we live here, we rely on the health of the environment for our own survival, for fishing, recreation and crop irrigation for the long haul.

L-0015/001

Regarding the proposed transporting of radioactive waste to Hanford: The current stated mission of Hanford is cleanup. It makes no sense to double the amount of radioactive and transuranic chemical waste being received, and then to bury it in unlined trenches. The legacy of groundwater contamination is frightening and unthinkable.

L-0015/002

It is imperative to put the health and well being of future generations ahead of the immediate profit and rampant politics of the Energy department and the Ecology department regarding Hanford.

## Hanford Cleanup

L-0016/019

Having meddled in such matters [radioactivity and associated waste], we can't just walk away, worse luck. So we have to deal with the mess we've got-which means that we must make the most conservative assumptions possible-we must assume that whatever's in those burial grounds is dangerous until proven harmless-and we must set a very high standard of proof.

L-0017/001

Given that the Hanford Nuclear Reservation is already the most contaminated site in the country, it is too risky to the public health to bring in additional waste to this overburdened site when substantial existing contamination is not contained (e.g. leaking tanks, groundwater, etc.), much less cleaned up.

L-0017/002

We oppose the import of any new waste to Hanford until the site is in compliance with all federal and state environmental regulations, and until a publicly vetted national strategy for the disposition of all DOE's nuclear wastes is established.

L-0018/002, TSE-0001/002

While progress has been made at the Hanford site, principally with respect to the K-Basin and cocooning of reactors, there is an enormous amount of work yet to be done, and a lot of uncertainty surrounding the future of the site. For these reasons, I have grave concerns about plans to import more wastes into the Hanford site, particularly when those wastes are put in unlined soil trench landfills.

L-0019/001, TSE-0002/001

For more than 60 years our federal government has used our state as the dumping grounds for nuclear waste. For years we were assured there would be little risk of endangerment of human health or the environment. Science, time, and common sense have demonstrated this to be at best a misrepresentation - at worst blatant lies. Much of the contamination occurred while the Department of Energy (DOE) claimed exemption from independent external environmental regulation. Finally, in 1989, the DOE entered into an agreement with our state and the tribal nations and the Environmental Protection Agency to clean up the hazards. This agreement has repeatedly been violated by the DOE. ... We were being asked to believe that the DOE would correct its neglect in cleaning up the existing toxic conditions - in exchange for doubling the nuclear waste it would dump at the site. Once again the public was assured of minimal risk of endangerment to human health or the environment. Tonight we are being asked to comment on a revised draft of last year's EIS. We are being asked to accept the promises, commitments, and projections of an agency backed by a history of years of malfeasance.

L-0019/008, TSE-0002/008

To this we add the current Administration's reprioritization of the DOE's budget for increased funding for nuclear programs that will generate more waste, and its proposal to make military use of nuclear energy exempt from environmental regulation. All this in the face of growing federal deficit spending and skyrocketing national debt that threatens the historically inadequate levels of funding for clean up of this site.

L-0019/009, TSE-0002/009

I continue to stand in opposition to this plan to import increased nuclear waste at Hanford.

L-0019/010, TSE-0002/010

I call for immediate action to clean up the existing contamination.

L-0020/002, TSE-0021/002

The DOE is using the legal system to leverage its enormous power against the democratically elected government of the state of Washington, -with U.S. citizen taxpayer money- to slow down, -no, to halt the U.S. taxpayer funded nuclear waste clean-up in the State of Washington, South Carolina, and Nevada just to name a few.

## Hanford Cleanup

L-0020/003, TSE-0021/003

The DOE has no intention of EVER cleaning up Hanford

L-0020/004, TSE-0021/004

For 58 years from 1945 to the present, the DOE has funded the manufacturing of radioactive nuclear waste with U.S. citizen taxpayer money, without our collective knowledge or our permission, and is responsible for past and future deaths of U.S. citizens resulting from radioactive contamination from its waste sites and its facilities. No, I've looked at this every ways I can, and it still doesn't make sense. This is outrageous! Take a good look in the mirror and tell me you like what you see. Tell me you're doing this for the good of the country.

L-0021/002, TSE-0015/002

The Hanford waste is a ticking time bomb. But, instead of trying to diffuse this threat by cleaning up waste and preventing more coming our way, the Bush Administration is going the opposite direction: threatening to stop clean up measures and planning to add 70,000 truckloads of radioactive and chemical waste to this area.

L-0021/006, TSE-0015/006

...stop importing waste into Hanford[.]

L-0021/007, TSE-0015/007

...clean up the mess that already threatens our human, river and wildlife health. Washingtonians don't want our state to become a national radioactive waste dump.

L-0023/001

I am very concerned about more waste being taken to Hanford. We can't handle the waste that we have now and we already have 2/3 of the Nations waste. Please stop further exportation [sic] of Nuclear waste from being brought to Hanford.

L-0025/001

Please stop Hanford from receiving anymore nuclear waste. We can't handle any more waste at Hanford! We've got to put this to a STOP[.]

L-0027/001

I passionately oppose the US Dept. of Energy plan to bring in 70,000 truckloads of new radioactive and chemical waste to be buried in unlined trenches at Hanford. The current mission of Hanford is cleanup. Doubling the total amount of radioactive and chemical waste, including deadly plutonium, is the very opposite of cleanup.

L-0027/004

Please spend all funding on cleanup, not on increasing the radioactive waste problem.

L-0028/001

We are writing to express our concern about the plans of the Department of Energy to send highly radioactive trash from out of state to the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. As you know, there have been efforts over many years to clean-up the Hanford Reservation. These plans negate the process that has been made and current efforts in court are only delaying further cleanup.

L-0032/001, LM-0005/001, LM-0006/001, LM-0007/001, LM-0008/001, LM-0009/001, LM-0010/001, LM-0011/001, LM-0012/001, LM-0013/001, LM-0014/001, LM-0015/001, LM-0016/001

My friends and I represent the masses who depend on this river for our livelihoods and our very lives. The tragedy of contaminated groundwater and the high cancer rate of downwinders cannot be an element of the past, until the increased dumping is stopped in the present.

L-0033/001

I am concerned that an accumulative impact of bringing more waste onto the Hanford Site will slow the

## Hanford Cleanup

cleanup process and will add to the environmental burden on our groundwater and the Columbia River.

L-0033/012

For 45 years beginning in 1943 the DOE and its predecessors made unwise and dangerous decisions about the temporary storage of waste. I have seen examples of the records. They are deplorable. The risk to public health and the environment continues to grow. For the last 35 years DOE has attempted to clean up this mess, but poor management, shifting priorities, incompetent contractors and the lack of political will have resulted in inadequate results. It will be an additional 35 years before significant results are complete. Such a dismal record will be a long remembered blight on our generation. We can and must do better.

L-0034/006

[The] new imported waste streams, both those proposed for storage and those proposed for processing and disposal, will only contribute to the current serious environmental problems at Hanford.

L-0035/001

Please stop the madness -- I implore you, no further import of radioactive waste coming into the state of Washington, and specifically Hanford, Transuranic or otherwise.

L-0035/004

...clean up the onsite waste[.]

L-0036/001

This is a request to enlist your help in stopping any further importing of radioactive waste into Hanford. There is more than enough there now! And I am very concerned about health impact on my grandchildren and expected great grandchild.

L-0037/002

Please stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial.

L-0040/001, LM-0019/001

[The] WAFP [Washington Academy of Family Physicians] opposes the import of additional nuclear wastes to Hanford Nuclear Reservation at least until the current waste at the overburdened Hanford is in compliance with state and federal regulations.

L-0043/001

Hanford's radioactive and hazardous waste burial grounds must be closed down!

L-0043/006

Economics, whose goal is to maximize profits for a few at any cost to the environment that sustains life for all, is stupid economics.

L-0044/142

As did the previous draft, the Revised HSW-EIS assumes that the USDOE's Record of Decision (ROD) (65 FR 100651 ff) to create a regional MLLW disposal operation at Hanford allows receipt of wastes from sites around the complex for disposal in the Hanford MLLW trenches. It also assumes that TRU waste will be brought to Hanford for processing and certification per a recent revision of the ROD (67 FR 56989 ff). TRU waste management, including offsite TRU waste shipments to Hanford, is currently the subject of litigation between the State of Washington and the U.S. Department of Energy.

The RHSW-EIS compares impacts of disposal of Hanford waste only versus Hanford plus lower- and upper-bound volumes of LLW and MLLW; but it assumes that the 2000 Record of Decision (ROD) (65FR10061) for the Waste Management (WM-PEIS) for disposal of LLW and MLLW will be implemented. Based on that assumption, the RHSW EIS does not consider off-site disposal alternatives for Hanford-generated MLLW and LLW.

## Hanford Cleanup

The tone of the HSW-EIS strongly suggests that it was driven by the imperative to support the 2000 ROD (and the 2002 modification of the TRU ROD that allows Hanford to become a consolidation center for TRU waste from other USDOE sites) under the WM-PEIS. Washington remains steadfast in its position that the WM-PEIS was not adequate for selecting sites for disposal of the waste inventories. The RHSW-EIS does not perform adequate independent assessment of the impacts of disposing of additional volumes of LLW and MLLW from other USDOE sites or transporting, consolidating, and storing TRU waste from other sites.

L-0051/001

I am writing to ask you and the [DOE] not to truck any more nuclear waste to [Hanford.]

L-0052/001

The ERWM [Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program at the Nez Perce Tribe (NPT)] sees this document as an appropriate starting point, not an end point, for dealing with the complexity of solid waste treatment, storage, and disposal at the Hanford Site. The HSW EIS in its current state, though very informational, is insufficient and lacking of assurances that the Hanford Site will be effectively cleaned up in both the short and long term.

L-0055/048

Because the Hanford Site cleanup is a technically complex and long-term program, with associated uncertainties both in terms of final cleanup end states and modeling techniques, cumulative impact analysis will necessarily contain those same uncertainties. There is obviously uncertainty in the modeling techniques. The final cleanup end states should be obvious. CTUIR would hope the end state of cleanup of the Hanford Site would be for the protection of the ground water and surface water resources so they may be used to the fullest possible potential and to fully protect the people living in the area for all time in the future. It is obvious that DOE would like to do as little as possible to clean this site.

L-0055/056

The EIS discussion attests that four billion liters of ground water has been treated to remove the substantial amounts of Chromium, Carbon Tetrachloride, Nitrate, Uranium, Technetium-99, and Strontium-90. "Substantial" is a relative term. There are still substantial quantities of these contaminants in the vadose zone that have not been removed and currently, DOE does not have plans to remove these contaminants. DOE is claiming removal for some of the wastes that are degrading naturally.

L-0057/002

Please stop import of such materials

L-0057/004

The mistakes of the past need to be attended to as well.

P-0001/001

Enough is enough --- No more waste shipments

P-0001/002

The job [clean up] should have been completed by now.

P-0002/001

I encourage you to do all you can to stop the shipment of radioactive waste to Hanford.

P-0003/001

I urge you to please take a stand against adding to the already troubled hazardous waste dump at Hanford. Let us focus our efforts towards cleaning up Hanford and reject any plan to bring in more waste. We must be proactive in coming up with solutions to lessen the impact of this radioactive waste dump in our beautiful state let alone increase the risks. Remember when Columbia was "the gem of the ocean"!



## Hanford Cleanup

P-0004/001

All these mistakes should be cleared up - not more added.

P-0007/001

I think we should be cleaning up Hanford, not burying more radioactive waste.

P-0008/001

ENOUGH RADIOACTIVE WASTE DUMPED IN WASHINGTON!

P-0008/004

ENOUGH UNFULFILLED CLEANUP PROMISES!

P-0008/007

ENOUGH TALK AND REPORTS, NOT ENOUGH CLEANUP.

P-0010/001

I urge no more wastes at Hanford[.]

P-0012/001

I want you to tell people the truth about the mess we are in. We should never have done this. It can not be contained or disposed of.

P-0013/001

The citizens of Washington are committed to the clean-up of Hanford's nuclear waste. Adding more waste will make the job even harder and more costly.

P-0014/001

Do not allow more radioactive waste to be dumped at Hanford!

P-0014/002

Hanford is a catastrophe that should be cleaned up and shut down forever - before any more damage can be done.

P-0015/001

How long is the gov't going to mess around at Hanford and not do anything? They have been spending millions yet nothing gets done.

P-0016/001

No additional waste should be dumped in the Hanford area - The risk to the inhabitants is TOO GREAT.

P-0017/001

Stop the Radioactive Waste Dump at Hanford... We have lived in Wenatchee all our lives - therefore worry about current and future health risks. What about the Columbia River - What about the Ocean!

P-0018/001

I do not understand why my government is deliberately try to add to the problems of cleanup at Hanford. Why is the government willing to risk human health by contaminating the water of Columbia River?

P-0022/001

[Start] the cleanup[.]

P-0022/002

Do not add anymore radioactive crap to the problem[.]

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0024/001

Please add no more nuclear waste to Hanford.

P-0025/001

CLEAN IT UP!

P-0026/001

Burying any more waste from offsite adds an additional burden to Hanford's clean-up.

P-0027/001

Disposal of more nuclear waste at the Hanford site from else where would make an already difficult cleanup even more so.

P-0028/001

It makes no sense to ship waste to a Superfund site. We can't clean up what we've got.

P-0029/002

It makes no sense to me to take in more radioactive material when we cannot handle what we already have at Hanford.

P-0030/001

Please don't send waste from all over to bury it in Hanford.

P-0030/002

Clean it up!

P-0032/002

Please stop dumping more radioactive waste at Hanford.

P-0032/003

Please increase the clean-up of Hanford and protect the mighty Columbia River from further contamination.

P-0033/001

We need to stop adding more radioactive waste to Hanford. We must stop adding chemical waste to Hanford.

P-0037/001

ENOUGH ALREADY!

P-0038/001

Do not ship more waste to Hanford. Clean up the mess that is there already.

P-0039/001

Why on earth should we allow more radioactive and chemical waste to be "buried" at Hanford, when it is already the most contaminated site in the nation? Dumping more such waste only increases the danger to human health and contamination of groundwater and the Columbia River.

P-0042/001

NO DUMP AT HANFORD

P-0042/002

Hanford's Area has been filthy in a nuclear was as long as it has existed, and yet the DOE has not continued to clean it up properly.

P-0043/001

Please stop bringing more waste to this state. We are already polluted enough.

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0044/002

How many years has it been since Hanford was declared a superfund site and it would be "cleaned up," a daunting project under the best of conditions.

P-0045/001

Please make them stop adding anything more to Hanford

P-0046/002

Clean up our present mess before we accept more!

P-0047/001

Stop the Hanford National Radioactive Waste Dump. The government has not been able to safely contain or clean-up the waste already at Hanford - more waste will not help us to do so.

P-0047/004

Do not allow more waste to be shipped to Hanford!

P-0048/001

I am strongly opposed to the US DOE's plan to make Hanford the National Radioactive Waste Dump. Oregon and Washington will be at increased risk of radioactive contamination, especially in regards to the Columbia River and local groundwater.

P-0048/002

Hanford Clean-up has been inadequate to date.

P-0050/001

Promised cleanup have not happened. The Columbia River is at great risk. This cleanup would increase the danger.

P-0051/001

...clean-up at Hanford is way below par. Do NOT send more radioactive waste to Hanford until a thorough clean-up has been done and a safe - truly safe - plan and system and the resources required for that has been adapted and shown to us citizens.

P-0052/001

At a time when Hanford is slowly being cleaned after decades of neglect, I don't find it is appropriate to ship highly toxic/radioactive waste to the site. In addition, I am concerned about accidents during transport that would threaten the public.

P-0053/001

I do not approve of more waste being dumped at Hanford. Environmental would be endangered.

P-0055/001

I want the US government to stop using Hanford as a national radioactive waste dump. I have major concerns that this site does not guarantee safety against the environmental and health risks.

P-0056/001

I believe Washington State at Hanford has received more than its share of Radioactive waste. Hanford is the nations most contaminated site, more waste increases the risk to health from contamination of the Columbia river. Shipping truckloads of radioactive and chemical waste increases risks to residents along Oregon and Washington Highways.

P-0057/002

The Health of the Environment & Humans should ALWAYS comes 1st! We want no more waste at Hanford & the surrounding area!

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0059/001

CLEAN UP WHAT'S THERE THOROUGHLY!

P-0059/002

DON'T ADD ANYMORE!

P-0060/001

I have no objection per se to additional radioactive waste being at Hanford given what is already there. However, that said, based on the past record of DOE at Hanford I do have concerns about how additional wastes will be handled. What assurances can you provide the public that storing additional wastes will not add to the many problems that have already reluctantly been made public? Unfortunately DOE's past record at Hanford does not build public trust.

P-0061/001

PLEASE NO MORE RADIOACTIVE WASTE TO OUR STATE. THE COLUMBIA RIVER IS IN JEOPARDY. WATER QUALITY. AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN.

P-0062/002

Burying more waste from offsite adds an unnecessary burden to Hanford Clean-up. Dumping more radioactive waste at Hanford increases the risk to our health from contaminated ground water, which is allowed to enter the Columbia River.

P-0063/001

The risks [of continuing with the Hanford waste dump] are high, the danger is long-term, and the contamination is extensive.

P-0064/001

I am very concerned about adding radioactive waste to the Hanford site when clean-up is supposed to be underway. Please do not add to the clean up problems at Hanford. This will end up costing all of us more time and money in the future. The Hanford area is not appropriate for a long-term storage site.

P-0067/001

No more No more Radioactive Waste in Hanford. Help save our Columbia River!! Be gentle with our earth!!

P-0070/001

We are trying to clean up the Hanford site - or at least keep it from getting worse. Why would we ever want to add more waste from outside the site?

P-0071/001

I am strongly opposed to the transporting and storage of more hazardous wastes at Hanford. Any chance of contamination of the Columbia River is totally unacceptable as it is one of our nation's most invaluable treasures.

P-0072/001

You must commit yourself and resources to actually cleaning up Hanford.

P-0073/001

The public was led to believe that the USDOE agreed to follow the TriState agreement and "Clean up" Hanford. Now you are accepting radioactive waste from elsewhere! How is this a clean up?

P-0074/002

More radioactive waste buried at Hanford will simply add to the nation's most contaminated radioactive waste site which is totally unacceptable. We no longer want the risks of contaminated groundwater

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0075/001

Please stop adding more radioactive and chemical waste to Hanford.

P-0076/001

It is imperative that no more waste be dumped at Hanford. The Columbia River is at risk.

P-0078/002

Hanford is already the nation's most contaminated site; burying more makes it worse. It allows contamination to enter the Columbia River for the next 150 years.

P-0079/001

When are you going to move Your Family, Your Children, their cousins, your Parents into this Waste area to Live? If you say Never it is too dangerous - the side effects are too serious to expose MY Loved ones to that mess, that drinking water, that polluted soil -- Then take ACTION! Because YOU CAN! Help the Northwest quality of Life.

P-0080/001

Please send NO more refuse & dangerous items to Washington State[.]

P-0081/001

Hanford is already the nation's most contaminated nuclear waste deposit site. PLEASE, NO MORE!!  
Radioactive contaminants are threatening the ground water as well as the river.

P-0081/002

CLEAN UP THE EXISTING MESS!!

P-0082/001

Hanford in Washington state needs no more dumping of radioactive waste. Its damaging the health of the mighty Columbia river and the ground water. It is not tolerated for any product to cause a health risk to every citizen in 2 states (in Oregon & Washington) via air, water or land contamination.

P-0084/002

Do not allow radioactive nor chemical waste to be added to the contamination already at Hanford.

P-0087/001

Please know that I do not support the continued practice of importing and burying radioactive & chemical waste. The shipping brings these materials down the interstate and increases risks along those highways.

P-0087/002

Hanford is already a environmental disaster & clean-up is slow. This [waste importation] further burdens this process & endangers the groundwater that is contaminated reaching the Columbia River.

P-0088/001

I am requesting that DOE quit stalling and playing games with the Hanford cleanup.

P-0088/002

I fully support a ban on any new waste coming to Hanford until the old waste is 100% cleaned up.

P-0089/002

Certainly don't add MORE waste.

P-0091/001

I would like my voice to be heard, along with many, many other citizens that national radioactive waste NOT be deposited at Hanford WA Site!

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0091/002

Hanford already has great & scary problems to get the existing radioactive material taken care of. If not for the health of the people in that area - think, think, think of the Columbia River contamination!

P-0092/002

Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the country. Burying any more adds unnecessary burdens to clean-up.

P-0093/003

[I am very concerned about DOE's current plan regarding] the added impact to Hanford Clean-up[.]

P-0094/001

It is not fair that the federal government takes years of talking - only, not doing - about cleaning up the mess they made of Hanford and finally act, not to perform on clean-up promises, but to bring in more waste[.]

P-0096/001

I am a Hanford Downwinder who is very concerned about adding more radioactive waste to Hanford. We need to take care of the waste already there.

P-0097/002

I don't think any new materials should be brought into Hanford.

P-0097/003

DOE's poor track record in dealing with wastes already present on the site gives me no confidence that new contaminants will be properly handled.

P-0097/004

CLEAN UP HANFORD NOW!!

P-0099/001

Hanford is already the nation's most contaminated site. Burying any more waste from offsite adds an unnecessary burden to Hanford clean up!

P-0100/001

Putting More Waste at Hanford is Ridiculous - Please Help to find a Better Solution!

P-0102/001

I am shocked to hear of the truckloads of chemical & radioactive waste being sent to Hanford - This will increase the risk of contamination to the ground water and Columbia river, it will add to the problem already there. This effects all residents of WA & OR. The Hanford clean up has been agonizingly slow for years. Its ridiculous to add to the problem already there.

P-0105/001

Now again after huge cost overruns, followed by shutdown - followed by unimaginable pollution of the area & the Columbia - we must hear that more "guk" is going to be disposed of at Hanford. This is outrageous! Stop it NOW.

P-0107/001

Before Hanford accepts more radioactive solid waste, they should be much further along in their cleanup activities.

P-0107/002

To date, their [Hanford's] record for the management of existing waste is not very good.

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0109/001

Please stop adding more radioactive chemical waste to Hanford!

P-0110/002

More waste will only add burden to the clean up.

P-0111/001

Please, Don't dump more waste at Hanford[.]

P-0112/001

I want to see Hanford completely cleaned up and not accept any more nuclear waste.

P-0113/003

I implore you to maximize the cleanup, not bring more waste to Hanford[.]

P-0114/001

Don't let the Hanford location become even more of a radioactive waste dump than it already is. We still don't know of the long term effects of what is already buried on this land.

P-0115/001

We do not want more toxic waste in Washington. Hanford is already the most radioactive spot in the U.S.A.

P-0115/002

What we need is a definite plan, along with the needed money, to keep radioactive waste from forever polluting the Columbia River.

P-0116/002

Second, why can't the USDOE get its act together and complete the cleanup at Hanford?

P-0118/001

For more than 20 years we have been seeking a cleanup of radioactive waste from the Hanford area - This waste had the potential of polluting the Columbia River & creating a crisis situation in the whole Pacific Northwest. Now in a contradictory policy the Federal govt. is attempting to store MORE nuclear waste in the Hanford area.

P-0118/002

For the sake of human and animal life in this area DON'T DO IT [store MORE nuclear waste in the Hanford area]!

P-0119/001

What right does our government have to condemn the Pacific Northwest to Radioactivity for the next 10,000 years?

P-0120/001

The only sane and responsible action is to clean up Hanford NOW and to send no more chemical or radioactive waste to Hanford.

P-0121/001

Sending more radioactive waste to Hanford, the nation's most contaminated site - including the added danger of transporting it to the site - just doesn't make sense. Don't do this! This needs to be re-planned and reworked. This land, this environment, this groundwater - it's in your power to help and sustain the healthful survival of all these things.

P-0122/002

Clean up Hanford according to the tri-party agreement.



## Hanford Cleanup

P-0124/001

Please stop the Hanford National Radioactive Waste Dump. It is already a contaminated area.

P-0124/003

Washington State produces much food for the U.S. and world. The land and water must be clean and not toxic for this production.

P-0125/001

Contamination of the ground water and the Columbia River has never been taken care of - why add more? We have greatly diminished fish and herd populations in that area. There are risks to human health as well from the river

P-0127/001

Please do not let Hanford become a National Radioactive Waste Dump. There is clearly too much danger of polluting the Columbia River.

P-0127/003

Cleanup efforts must be begun now and be effective!

P-0128/001

We must clean up the present dangerous waste now residing at Hanford, polluting the land and Columbia River.

P-0128/002

Also, no more radioactive waste should be stored there [Hanford]. No one who lives close to such a storage place would welcome it, but Hanford is in such a dangerous area with the river and Hanford Reach so close, which is such a unique area!

P-0130/001

The contents already existing at Hanford are enough of a hazard to our environment. I would like to see real efforts (not promises) in cleaning up this poorly handled and dangerous site and not add more to the problem.

P-0131/001

Please clean up and close down Hanford once and for all.

P-0132/001

I understand from all reports on TV and in papers (newspapers) etc., that Hanford is already one of the most polluted sites on planet Earth. How can you dare add more contaminated material? You will have to answer to some one, some day, be it a higher authority, the general public, a court inquiry, a senate investigation, etc. CAN YOU HAVE A GOOD ANSWER?

P-0134/001

We must prevent the further contamination of the Columbia River by rapidly and safely containing the current accumulation and stopping the importation of waste from other sources.

P-0135/004

No more waste to Hanford! Stop NOW[.]

P-0136/002

With Hanford not cleaned up 58 years after the end of World War II, think of the irreplaceable damage this EIS will further do to the great Columbia river, the Indians who fish on it, and the damage to the ecology of the state of Washington

P-0137/001

Stop adding to the radioactive waste at Hanford.

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0138/001

The "clean-up" of leaking tanks, etc. at Hanford is a government scandal because after billions of dollars have been spent, the Columbia River - one of the nation's spectacular rivers - is still being polluted by radioactive waste...As is the whole large area surrounding Hanford. ... why have the expensive contractors paid to clean up Hanford been unable (or unwilling) to complete the job?

P-0140/001

[Clean] up has been slow and has not been effective.

P-0143/001

Please stop the radioactive waste dump at Hanford. It is already the nations most contaminated site. It will increase the risk to human health from contaminated groundwater. It will allow contaminated flow into the Columbia River.

P-0144/001

Please stop the Hanford National Radioactive Waste Dump.

P-0145/001

Please do all you can to stop the nuclear waste storage at Hanford. It is already a most contaminated site which has a history of leaks and environmental damage.

P-0148/002

Second, do not import any more waste to Hanford. First we must clean up the old mess!

P-0149/003

Focus on cleaning up and monitoring Hanford's onsite waste now[.]

P-0150/001

Please do not bring any more waste to Hanford - it's time to clean up what is there now.

P-0152/001

Please do not bring any more waste into Hanford. It is already too great a hazard to a large area.

P-0154/001

No waste should be shipped to Hanford. Never!

P-0155/001

We demand clean up!

P-0155/002

We demand a clean state to grow up in! No more toxic waste!!!!

P-0156/001

Please no more waste to Hanford. We have had enough.

P-0157/001

Nothing has been changed with this latest analysis; it is still a shell game.

P-0157/002

We cannot afford to take in more waste at Hanford. This is not about cleanup.

P-0158/001

Say no to 70,000 tons of toxic waste "Cleanup."

## Hanford Cleanup

P-0159/001

It is beyond reason that more radioactives should be dumped at Hanford when the cleanup of existing is totally inadequate. Save the Columbia river, its people and resources!!

P-0160/001

Hanford is unquestionably the most toxic waste site in the nation. It has for half a century been a "sacrifice" area. To introduce an additional 70,000 truck loads at this time is unconscionable as there is absolutely NO ADEQUATE STORAGE AVAILABLE thus assuring leakage into the Columbia [river] which is used to irrigate food crops.

P-0161/001

Stop the waste. Very much a hazard to people and the environment.

P-0162/001

Please no more waste to Hanford. We have had enough.

P-0163/001

NO MORE TOXIC WASTE! SAY NO TO 70,000 TONS OF TOXIC WASTE! Cleanup not stock up!

P-0166/003

Clean up what we have now before getting more [radioactive waste].

P-0167/001

I am against the dumping of any further nuclear waste at [the] Hanford site in Washington State. Hanford is already the most contaminated site in the country. I am really concerned about the risk of contamination of the Columbia River nearby.

P-0167/003

The government has not done enough clean up

P-0168/001

NO Dumping @ Hanford.

P-0169/001

I am greatly disturbed to learn of USDOE's plans to ship more radioactive waste to Hanford. The government has not honored its commitment to clean up what is already there and now you want to send more! Hanford is the nation's most contaminated site! As a citizen of the NW [northwest], I adamantly oppose future threats to our safety and well-being.

P-0172/001

It would be a travesty if wastes from other areas of the country are brought to Hanford for storage. Hanford is not dealing effectively with the waste that was produced there. Until that pollution is dealt with effectively, no other waste should be shipped to Hanford

P-0173/001

The needed clean up at Hanford has not taken place. We need to protect the river and the land by properly taking care of the waste that's already there - not dump more.

THR-0009/003

And we have the dirtiest site on the continent, and we are talking about bringing more stuff to it. It just is illogical, and I oppose that. I don't think anything, any option should include that. It's not reasonable.

THR-0009/008

And I don't think the site should be having to handle more waste coming there.

## Hanford Cleanup

THR-0011/002

But all of that's [the progress made to date at Hanford] at risk right now with the USDOE saying that they want to double the amount of waste at Hanford, that they are playing shell games with the terminology.

THR-0011/004

And yet that's [waste denoted as "low-level" in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement] what they're [DOE] saying they're going to ship here and bury in unlined trenches for the next five to six years, next to the Columbia River.

THR-0012/004

Those of you who have been coming to these [public meetings] for 12 or 20 years or more, there was movement, positive movement [towards cleanup], and all of a sudden, two years ago, things changed. All of a sudden we have the highest level of radioactive material scheduled to come into our backyard.

THR-0012/005

The logic of this is simply - no waste to come in, and clean up the huge mess that we have now.

THR-0012/006

And that [the Hanford cleanup] was beginning to be discussed, and now it no longer is. It's just pile it all in, quick, fast, before anybody can say anything.

THR-0017/002

We need to spend as much money as we spent bombing the hell [sic] out of Iraq to clean up the mess, not make any more, just get it over with.

TLG-0001/001

I guess the credibility question that I have is: Right now at Hanford we have this really huge environmental problem. And like the gentleman mentioned earlier, it's supposed to be cleaned up. And I just don't see the wisdom in adding to the problem until we get a handle on the problem we already have.

TLG-0001/002

The other thing is we're talking about two of the lifelines to Eastern Oregon: one is the Columbia River, the other is the freeway. And I have a problem messing with either one of them, potentially, in terms of radioactive waste.

TLG-0003/002

I also have concerns that we're bringing more waste into Hanford when we haven't dealt with the problems that currently exist there.

TLG-0004/002

Until we know that we actually can deal with the waste that we have there, and we can deal with it in a way where conditions don't get worse but actually improve, we shouldn't be accepting any more waste. And I can't say exactly what's in that revised EIS, but I don't understand how DOE can propose to go forward with this addressing the impacts that have been brought to bear upon the fisheries downstream and the recreational users downstream, when I don't think they're really aware of what those impacts are.

TLG-0005/001

I just want to let you know, Hanford has enough. It's got so much stuff up there and we can't deal with what we have. And why are we adding more?

TLG-0006/001

Which was, first, is that we need to deal with the problem that we have already, before we start adding to this problem, because it's just going to build up and build up until our next generations are going to be forced to deal with our problems that we can deal with now by starting to learn.

## Hanford Cleanup

TLG-0008/002

I know that people will try to do their best, but I don't see that shipping high-level wastes and transuranics to a place that already has its problems dealing with what we currently have is going to make any of this better.

TLG-0010/002

And it makes much more sense to me to come at it from asking us what it would take for us to be okay, to feel that we have a place to dump and store this stuff. It has to be dumped and stored. And the people who live here, to be able to respond with what it would take for us to be okay with it. And I think that you're going at it backwards, and it's not going to work and we're not going to buy it.

TPO-0001/001

I've heard comments about the clean up of Hanford, and yet all I hear is bringing in more waste and nothing about how much you've cleaned up. And this is very disparaging.

TPO-0003/001

What we've asked for and what we've been promised is clean up. To import additional waste is immoral, it's unconscionable.

TPO-0004/001

How can you send truckloads of waste when you haven't done anything to what you have there now?

TPO-0004/002

It's also, health wise, it's [bringing additional waste to Hanford] destructive for us and for everything -- for environmentally, the water, the air, everything.

TPO-0005/004

Here we have Hanford. And we have -- it's already a mess. And they're trying to clean it up, but they're not succeeding. And now we're going to add multi-millions of, you know like in terms of magnitude, the amount of compared to what there is. Maybe not millions. But I'm trying -- I'm exaggerating. But geometric amounts, more than what there already is there to make it even more difficult.

TPO-0006/005

We do feel very strongly that we ought to hold off on importation of large amounts of additional waste from offsite until we are confident that the most important treatment facility at Hanford is going to be constructed and meet capability. And that's the vitrification plant at Hanford. So we would like to see this document withdrawn and held in abeyance until we're convinced that the vit plant will be up and running on time.

TPO-0008/001

Number one, we've got concerns about the length of time the process is taking to clean up the Hanford complex.

TPO-0008/004

Of course, it sounds like we're not talking too much about cleanup, it's just putting some more in there.

TPO-0009/001

DOE looks at Hanford and says "Oh, the place is ruined. We might as well put more there."

TPO-0009/002

And I do not want that river contaminated. I want Hanford cleaned up, I do not want it increased.

TPO-0011/004

And the other part that's cheaper is the fact that this is free land that they are wasting it. They are saying this is a loss, a total loss. It is a sacrificed site.

## Hanford Cleanup

TPO-0011/005

DOE never has had to follow the law. That's the whole point: The DOE never has had to follow the law.

TPO-0011/012

Look, this is about cleanup. This should only be about clean up.

TPO-0013/001

The nuclear and toxic contamination already at Hanford is virtually assured to contaminate both the water, the land, and the air in our lifetimes, and will continue to accumulate for many generations to come. Today the DOE has proposed to add to that contamination, of the past, by importing large volumes of additional wastes. Perhaps some view Hanford area as a national sacrifice zone, that it's already so contaminated that adding more does not affect it, I refuse to give up so easily. We must focus now on minimizing the existing risks here through the best available means of containment and treatment.

TPO-0013/006

How long will additional waste import delay the clean up of the existing waste?

TPO-0013/009

How do you plan to keep us and our children safe for the next generation or two or three? Much less, a quarter of a million years from now.

TPO-0014/002

And if you're going to destroy an area of land and leave it a permanent disaster with no possible cleanup in sight, how are you going to -- why don't you put it somewhere where there's not a big source of water? Because water is going to be worth more than gold in the future.

TPO-0014/003

If we can't clean up Hanford as it already is, then how are we going to clean up a thousand times worse than Hanford, when there's not going to be any resources, because we're going to be in debt up to our eyeballs for as far as we can see.

TPO-0015/002

They're [People are] wondering "What in the world is going on that it doesn't seem like much is happening to really clean up Hanford."

TPO-0015/003

They [people] do not want waste to be brought in. We've got plenty, thank you very much.

TPO-0015/011

We have the DOE dumping for five decades already in Hanford. I distrust anything that's fast track and not thoroughly thought through, thoroughly evaluated.

TPO-0015/013

We must contain and treat and store the wastes already at Hanford, not bring in any additional wastes.

TPO-0016/003

So in light of this, the DOE has to say, "We're going to clean this place up," and they are doing some things, give them some credit here and there, to protect the river, cocoon reactors. You know, dry out the spent fuel. All of these are kind of caretaker responsibilities, but, we're here in the Northwest community, very suspicious about the fact that about 12½ million cubic feet of waste is coming our way over the next 45 years. ... It's not clean up. It's a dump site. ... the Department of Energy and the U.S. Government has given up on cleaning up Hanford and it's just going to take waste from all over the country and dump it here. And we object to that.

TPO-0017/002

When we did our weapons production, it left us in a very fine mess. With the less than visionary, and the

## Hanford Cleanup

inept, and the sometimes immoral management, has made Hanford the number one emergency site and the number two emergency site in the DOE complex in the country.

TPO-0017/006

And when we have the accelerated cleanup at Hanford, and when they show us that we can do this, then we can import waste from other sites.

TPO-0018/001

And we mean we don't want any more of this stuff. This is very lethal. We are totally against it.

TPO-0019/001

Our first priority must be to remove the existing waste and treat it so that it no longer threatens the citizens of the Northwest before we increase the amount of new waste being shipped to Hanford.

TPO-0021/003

We want no more poison waste.

TPO-0021/004

We want what is Hanford cleaned up. We want no more weapons, because that is a foundation of Hanford.

TRI-0001/006

We should not focus on how much more waste we will add before we have a baseline of what is already here and an EIS that describes what we will be doing with what is already here.

TRI-0001/016

It is senseless from the public's point of view and from the point of view of the environment to describe building modern facilities to take a million cubic feet of waste a year while ignoring the facilities that are contaminating the soil. It is unacceptable and it leaves this EIS legally inadequate, and it must be corrected.

TSE-0003/002, TSE-0004/002, TSE-0005/002, TSE-0006/002, TSE-0007/002

For cleanup is what we all want. And we're not satisfied.

TSE-0003/003, TSE-0004/003, TSE-0005/003, TSE-0006/003, TSE-0007/003

We won't take any more new waste 'til what's here is all clean[.]

TSE-0003/004, TSE-0004/004, TSE-0005/004, TSE-0006/004, TSE-0007/004

We're sick of being your waste dump[.]

TSE-0003/009, TSE-0004/009, TSE-0005/009, TSE-0006/009, TSE-0007/009

Clean up the spoil and groundwater[.]

TSE-0003/010, TSE-0004/010, TSE-0005/010, TSE-0006/010, TSE-0007/010

Meet all of the legal deadlines[.]

TSE-0011/007

It's [Contamination is] not a problem they have addressed. What they are trying to do is contain the public by putting up institutional controls that will fail to have the public get to an area which is massively contaminated. It is not being contained.

TSE-0012/003

For the low-level waste, as well as all other wastes, line the trenches, install legal groundwater monitoring, provide leachate collection, install weather proof caps, and do it now.

TSE-0013/002

...we are not doing well with the waste that we have.



## Hanford Cleanup

TSE-0013/004

We have a serious present and future public health problem that if they could step forward and say, well, we have adequately characterized it, we have lined the trenches, and we have a national problem, and we need a national dialogue about how we all share that burden nationally, then maybe, and maybe it would be years from now, we'd say we could entertain possibly bringing in some of that if there's a place for it to be handled properly.

TSE-0013/005

I think it's totally out of the question to be even talking about it [bringing in more waste] until we have done a safe job as far as public health and the environment with what we have.

TSE-0017/008

I'm against the importation of any new waste to Hanford because adding to this problem is not solving it, and is not responsible care of our country, our resources, and the people that live here.

TSE-0017/009

So, withdraw this illegal, incomplete, and insulting EIS and do not come back until you are ready to solve Hanford's problems.

TSE-0019/001

...my comment is that Hanford already has a big enough contamination problem without adding waste to it or continuing to store waste in low-level burial grounds. ... Adding waste to Hanford will slow cleanup of tainted soil and water and it will add to contamination levels at Hanford. The U.S. Department of Energy should not import any off-site waste into Hanford and add to the enormous amount of contamination already threatening the Columbia River and in some cases having reached the Columbia River already.

TSE-0020/001

I have a very brief comment to follow up on the physicians that were up here representing WPSR, which that it is unwise, unfair, and unacceptable for the DOE to ask the citizens of Washington or Oregon to assume the additional health risks that will come with additional wastes imported to Hanford.

TSE-0024/006

And so with this Environmental Impact Statement, you will have the lowest bidding contractor come, they are going to want to cut a lot of corners, and they are going to get sued for whatever crimes that they do, and when the federal government pays them, I don't want the federal government to use taxpayer money to reimburse their legal fees. That should come out of the corporation's pockets.

TSE-0025/002

Actually, I don't think that the way things are going, we will ever get around to cleaning it up. And that the peacocks and the giraffes will be long extinct, and probably human beings will be long extinct, and Hanford will still be producing its toxins.

TSE-0026/003

This is where the DOE's focus should be, on dealing with the waste that is already contaminating Hanford.

TSE-0027/001

...no more waste at Hanford[.]

TSE-0027/009

We need to clean up first, prove it is really done, and then that's enough. No more.

TSE-0029/001

We have to do the best we can to contain this stuff [radioactive waste], and quit adding any more at all.

## Hanford Cleanup

TSE-0032/001

I don't trust my government, because this government is spending a billion dollars a day spreading depleted uranium on other countries in the form of bombs. We are worried about international terrorism. Our Department of Energy is committing terrorism on our country. In fact I suppose they are going to have to ship some of our uranium over to RUX [Russia?], because they can only find precursors, and we have got all the precursors here. I think that we have a government that doesn't represent us, and that dealing with the Department of Energy is like dealing with a Patonkin village. It is just a facade. It is a pretense. The Environmental Impact Statements have been a total fraud. There's not even the appearance of fairness. They don't have any intention of keeping their contracts. And when your government doesn't believe in keeping its own contracts, it's -- it loses legitimacy.

TSE-0033/001

I really want to make a statement that we really need so desperately to take care of our entire planet, and we need to do that by being responsible citizens and being aware of what we're doing to our environment, our citizens, our friends, our family members, and our children and their children. So, I think that we really have to take it seriously, and do as much as we can to make it a better world, and make it a world that all of us can live in, and be healthy and safe in.

TSP-0001/001

I am here to at least have you think about our children and our children's children, and the impact of continued waste shipments

TSP-0001/007

I don't think it's right or reasonable to dump on Hanford even more waste and contribute to the problem.

TSP-0002/003

I believe the waste that is at Hanford should be handled properly before we allow any further waste to come in and be added to it.

TSP-0006/003

I object to the waste being brought to Hanford when the accumulated waste is not yet analyzed, and this is not done in the EIS.

TSP-0006/007

The present waste that's there, the length of time, and as far as I can remember, they have never met the timelines for cleanup that they have made in the past.

TSP-0010/001

The wastes there should be cleaned up first [before dumping more waste at Hanford].

TSP-0010/002

Adding more waste just complicates matters [of cleanup].

TSP-0011/001

And we have struggled, we people are being victimized here by the incongruous thinking processes of a DOE that is being intimidated by an administration that feels that they can make a new strategy and they are having a different goal.

TSP-0017/001

...we can all say not in my backyard[.]

## Response

Hanford is part of a nationwide cleanup effort of over 100 DOE sites and cooperates with these sites in the cleanup. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the

## Hanford Cleanup

safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel.

DOE is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. As of February 1, 2003, DOE had met 99% of its TPA milestones on or ahead of schedule. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. Groundwater contamination beneath the Hanford Site is being studied and remediated by the ongoing CERCLA program in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement. The Hanford clean-up effort is expected to be completed in 2035, followed by a long-term stewardship program that ensures waste remaining onsite is appropriately managed. See Volume II Appendix N, Section N.2.4. See Volume III Section 2, Item 6 of the CRD for more examples of cleanup at Hanford.

The WM PEIS (DOE 1997b) was a comprehensive evaluation of DOE nationwide waste management. The WM PEIS evaluated a broad suite of alternatives for waste management across the DOE complex, including managing most waste at generator facilities, or consolidating waste management at fewer sites that have existing facilities suitable to accept waste from other facilities. The general result of the WM PEIS was that radioactive and hazardous wastes generated at a DOE site should be disposed of at that site unless the site was not capable of or not technically able to support those actions. DOE determined there was sufficient information in the WM PEIS to support decisions regarding the sites that were suitable for long-term waste management missions. Those decisions included processing and disposing of Hanford waste at Hanford, and the importation of wastes from other sites that could not adequately handle them. Decisions made as part of the WM PEIS made Hanford available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from other DOE generators. The initial WM PEIS decisions related to LLW, MLLW, and TRU waste were issued between January 1998 and February 2000.

Additional wastes will be generated as part of the cleanup of Hanford and other DOE sites. The HSW EIS evaluates several alternatives for the storage, treatment, and processing of wastes from onsite and offsite generators, and a range of waste receipts at Hanford to encompass the uncertainties regarding quantities of waste that would ultimately be managed at the site. Hanford would receive some LLW, MLLW, and would temporarily store some TRU waste from other DOE sites. Plutonium production, the source of most of the waste created, has stopped at Hanford. TRU waste, high-level waste, and spent nuclear fuel will be sent to underground repositories in other states that have been designed to safely contain the waste. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite.

The Hanford area has been extensively studied and determined to be suitable for disposal of DOE and commercial waste. The impacts of disposing various quantities and types of waste are discussed in this HSW EIS as well as previous NEPA documentation. See Volume I Section 1.5. The evaluations in the HSW EIS provide a basis with which to determine the impacts of varying quantities of offsite waste at Hanford. The waste volumes evaluated include a Lower Bound waste volume consisting mainly of Hanford waste, and an Upper Bound volume that includes additional quantities of offsite waste that Hanford might receive consistent with WM PEIS decisions.

The HSW EIS considers a wide range of alternatives for disposal of low level waste in both lined and unlined facilities. Lined trench alternatives include leak detection and leachate collection capabilities. The use of unlined trenches for disposal of low level waste is an established, legal, and environmentally protective method of low level waste disposal at both DOE and commercial facilities. As such, it is a reasonable

## Hanford Cleanup

alternative, under CEQ regulations, and must be analyzed. The preferred alternative is to dispose of low level waste in newly constructed lined disposal facilities as soon as they are available. For purposes of analysis the HSW EIS assumes this would occur by 2007. All MLLW is currently, and will continue to be, disposed of in lined facilities. Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to TPA requirements, the Hanford Dangerous Waste Management permit, and DOE Orders. Groundwater monitoring will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations.

The HSW EIS evaluates impacts to the Columbia River and downstream populations for about 10,000 years. For all alternatives analyzed in this HSW EIS, DOE has analyzed the long-term movement of contaminants through soil and groundwater to the Columbia River. In all cases, it found that the water quality of the Columbia River would be virtually indistinguishable from the current river background levels. The concentrations of all the constituent contaminants were well below benchmark drinking water standards at a hypothetical well located near the Columbia River. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Volume I Section 5.3 and Volume II Appendix G. See also Volume I Sections 5.11 and Volume II Appendices F, G, and L. Evaluations in the WM PEIS, the HSW EIS, and related NEPA documents indicate that additional wastes could be handled at Hanford without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.

Several mitigation measures have been built into the alternatives addressed in the final HSW EIS, including installation of barriers, liners, and leachate collection systems in disposal facilities; treatment of MLLW to meet applicable RCRA and state requirements; and in-trench grouting or use of HICs for Cat 3 LLW and MLLW. Some of these measures reduced the estimated levels of groundwater contamination relative to those presented in the revised draft. As set forth in Volume I Section 5.3, constituent concentrations in groundwater at 1 km from the disposal site are expected to be below the benchmark drinking water standards for the proposed action. Water quality in the Columbia River would be virtually indistinguishable from the current background levels.

DOE does not and will not rely solely on long-term stewardship to protect people and the environment. As indicated in the DOE sponsored report "Long-Term Institutional Management of U.S. Department of Energy Legacy Waste Sites" (National Research Council 2000) "contaminant reduction is preferred to contaminant isolation and the imposition of stewardship measures." Contaminant reduction is a large part of the ongoing cleanup efforts at Hanford. Most of the analyses in the HSW EIS are based on the assumption that long-term institutional controls will no longer be in effect 100 years after closure (about 2150 AD). Long-term groundwater impacts and subsequent human health impacts were determined based on the assumption that caps will degrade and eventually provide no protection (see Volume I Sections 5.3 and 5.11 and Volume II Appendices F and G). In addition, "intruder scenarios" are analyzed to determine the impacts of gaining access to the site (i.e., no institutional controls) and digging or drilling into waste sites (see Section 5.11.2.2 in Volume I and Section F.3 of Appendix F in Volume II). Further information on DOE's long-term stewardship activities can be found in the Long-Term Stewardship Study (DOE 2001a). The discussions of long-term stewardship in Volume I Sections 2.2.7 and 5.18 have been revised in response to comments.

This HSW EIS complies with applicable NEPA requirements. The cleanup of active DOE waste sites and facilities is regulated under the Atomic Energy Act, as well as the applicable provisions of the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the State of Washington Hazardous Waste Management Act, and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. Volume I Section 6 identifies the major statutes, permits, compliance agreements, and regulatory requirements followed in conducting operations at Hanford Site. Statutes include AEA, CERCLA, RCRA and the State of Washington HWMA. Volume I Section 6.3 discusses the TPA. Volume I Section 6.4 discusses the Dangerous Waste Management permit. Volume I Section 6.19 provides a summary of existing and potential permits (including state approved permits where state decision-making will be necessary) required to construct and operate treatment, storage, and disposal facilities related to the HSW EIS alternatives. Volume I Section 6 has been updated in

## Hanford Cleanup

the final HSW EIS. More specific provisions for cleanup of active Hanford waste sites and facilities are presented in the Tri-Party Agreement and in portions of the Hanford Dangerous Waste Management permit.

In response to public comments, DOE has conducted a route- and generator-specific offsite transportation analysis using updated highway routing and 2000 census data (See Volume I, Section 5.8 and Volume II, Appendix H of this document). The potential impacts identified in the updated evaluation are similar to those presented in the WM PEIS and the WIPP SEIS-II, and would not change conclusions or DOE-wide waste management decisions based on those studies. The HSW EIS estimates that up to 33,900 shipments of LLW, MLLW, and TRU waste could be shipped to Hanford if the upper bound waste volumes are realized. The actual number of shipments is expected to be less than this.

---

### Comments

L-0034/001

The DOE's mission at Hanford since 1989 has been cleanup. USDOE, the Washington Department of Ecology, and the US Environmental Protection Agency, working via the "Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order," also called the "Tri-Party Agreement" (TPA), have previously established two legally binding consent agreement vitrification cleanup schedules by which the DOE was to bring the Hanford site into compliance with state and federal environmental laws.

Unfortunately DOE failed to meet the cleanup schedule of the first of these agreements, and has now made an end run around the second by developing a plan to eliminate vitrification of 75% of the nation's High-Level Nuclear Wastes from nuclear weapons production, much of which resides at Hanford. Included in the fallout of this plan was the shipment of an initial 170 barrels of "Remote-Handled Transuranic" (RH TRU) wastes to Hanford. Additional shipments of RH TRU waste, as well as additional 70,000 truckloads of low level solid and mixed waste are planned.

In return for Washington State acceptance of these additional waste shipments, DOE promised to renegotiate the second consent agreement with the office of the State Attorney General. However, the second consent agreement itself was legally binding, without Washington State being required to take on more waste. Yet even after Washington State agreed to accept more waste, DOE failed in its promise of a new cleanup timetable.

### Response

Hanford is part of a nationwide cleanup effort of over 100 DOE sites and cooperates with these sites in the cleanup. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel.

DOE is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. As of February 1, 2003, DOE had met 99% of its TPA milestones on or ahead of schedule. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. Groundwater contamination beneath the Hanford Site is being studied and remediated by the ongoing CERCLA program in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement. The Hanford clean-up effort is expected to be completed in 2035, followed by a long-term stewardship program that ensures waste remaining onsite is appropriately managed. See Volume II Appendix N, Section N.2.4. See Volume III Section 2, Item 6 of the CRD for more examples of cleanup at Hanford.

## Hanford Cleanup

The WM PEIS (DOE 1997b) was a comprehensive evaluation of DOE nationwide waste management. The WM PEIS evaluated a broad suite of alternatives for waste management across the DOE complex, including managing most waste at generator facilities, or consolidating waste management at fewer sites that have existing facilities suitable to accept waste from other facilities. The general result of the WM PEIS was that radioactive and hazardous wastes generated at a DOE site should be disposed of at that site unless the site was not capable of or not technically able to support those actions. DOE determined there was sufficient information in the WM PEIS to support decisions regarding the sites that were suitable for long-term waste management missions. Those decisions included processing and disposing of Hanford waste at Hanford, and the importation of wastes from other sites that could not adequately handle them. Decisions made as part of the WM PEIS made Hanford available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from other DOE generators. The initial WM PEIS decisions related to LLW, MLLW, and TRU waste were issued between January 1998 and February 2000.

Additional wastes will be generated as part of the cleanup of Hanford and other DOE sites. The HSW EIS evaluates several alternatives for the storage, treatment, and processing of wastes from onsite and offsite generators, and a range of waste receipts at Hanford to encompass the uncertainties regarding quantities of waste that would ultimately be managed at the site. Hanford would receive some LLW, MLLW, and would temporarily store some TRU waste from other DOE sites. Plutonium production, the source of most of the waste created, has stopped at Hanford. TRU waste, high-level waste, and spent nuclear fuel will be sent to underground repositories in other states that have been designed to safely contain the waste. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite.

The Hanford area has been extensively studied and determined to be suitable for disposal of DOE and commercial waste. The impacts of disposing various quantities and types of waste are discussed in this HSW EIS as well as previous NEPA documentation. See Volume I Section 1.5. The evaluations in the HSW EIS provide a basis with which to determine the impacts of varying quantities of offsite waste at Hanford. The waste volumes evaluated include a Lower Bound waste volume consisting mainly of Hanford waste, and an Upper Bound volume that includes additional quantities of offsite waste that Hanford might receive consistent with WM PEIS decisions.

The HSW EIS considers a wide range of alternatives for disposal of low level waste in both lined and unlined facilities. Lined trench alternatives include leak detection and leachate collection capabilities. The use of unlined trenches for disposal of low level waste is an established, legal, and environmentally protective method of low level waste disposal at both DOE and commercial facilities. As such, it is a reasonable alternative, under CEQ regulations, and must be analyzed. The preferred alternative is to dispose of low level waste in newly constructed lined disposal facilities as soon as they are available. For purposes of analysis the HSW EIS assumes this would occur by 2007. All MLLW is currently, and will continue to be, disposed of in lined facilities. Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to TPA requirements, the Hanford Dangerous Waste Management permit, and DOE Orders. Groundwater monitoring will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations.

The HSW EIS evaluates impacts to the Columbia River and downstream populations for about 10,000 years. For all alternatives analyzed in this HSW EIS, DOE has analyzed the long-term movement of contaminants through soil and groundwater to the Columbia River. In all cases, it found that the water quality of the Columbia River would be virtually indistinguishable from the current river background levels. The concentrations of all the constituent contaminants were well below benchmark drinking water standards at a hypothetical well located near the Columbia River. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Volume I Section 5.3 and Volume II Appendix G. See also Volume I Sections 5.11 and Volume II Appendixes F, G, and L. Evaluations in the WM PEIS, the HSW EIS, and related NEPA documents indicate that additional wastes could be handled at Hanford without complicating future remediations, or



## Hanford Cleanup

diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.

Several mitigation measures have been built into the alternatives addressed in the final HSW EIS, including installation of barriers, liners, and leachate collection systems in disposal facilities; treatment of MLLW to meet applicable RCRA and state requirements; and in-trench grouting or use of HICs for Cat 3 LLW and MLLW. Some of these measures reduced the estimated levels of groundwater contamination relative to those presented in the revised draft. As set forth in Volume I Section 5.3, constituent concentrations in groundwater at 1 km from the disposal site are expected to be below the benchmark drinking water standards for the proposed action. Water quality in the Columbia River would be virtually indistinguishable from the current background levels.

DOE does not and will not rely solely on long-term stewardship to protect people and the environment. As indicated in the DOE sponsored report "Long-Term Institutional Management of U.S. Department of Energy Legacy Waste Sites" (National Research Council 2000) "contaminant reduction is preferred to contaminant isolation and the imposition of stewardship measures." Contaminant reduction is a large part of the ongoing cleanup efforts at Hanford. Most of the analyses in the HSW EIS are based on the assumption that long-term institutional controls will no longer be in effect 100 years after closure (about 2150 AD). Long-term groundwater impacts and subsequent human health impacts were determined based on the assumption that caps will degrade and eventually provide no protection (see Volume I Sections 5.3 and 5.11 and Volume II Appendices F and G). In addition, "intruder scenarios" are analyzed to determine the impacts of gaining access to the site (i.e., no institutional controls) and digging or drilling into waste sites (see Section 5.11.2.2 in Volume I and Section F.3 of Appendix F in Volume II). Further information on DOE's long-term stewardship activities can be found in the Long-Term Stewardship Study (DOE 2001a). The discussions of long-term stewardship in Volume I Sections 2.2.7 and 5.18 have been revised in response to comments.

This HSW EIS complies with applicable NEPA requirements. The cleanup of active DOE waste sites and facilities is regulated under the Atomic Energy Act, as well as the applicable provisions of the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the State of Washington Hazardous Waste Management Act, and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. Volume I Section 6 identifies the major statutes, permits, compliance agreements, and regulatory requirements followed in conducting operations at Hanford Site. Statutes include AEA, CERCLA, RCRA and the State of Washington HWMA. Volume I Section 6.3 discusses the TPA. Volume I Section 6.4 discusses the Dangerous Waste Management permit. Volume I Section 6.19 provides a summary of existing and potential permits (including state approved permits where state decision-making will be necessary) required to construct and operate treatment, storage, and disposal facilities related to the HSW EIS alternatives. Volume I Section 6 has been updated in the final HSW EIS. More specific provisions for cleanup of active Hanford waste sites and facilities are presented in the Tri-Party Agreement and in portions of the Hanford Dangerous Waste Management permit.

In response to public comments, DOE has conducted a route- and generator-specific offsite transportation analysis using updated highway routing and 2000 census data (See Volume I, Section 5.8 and Volume II, Appendix H of this document). The potential impacts identified in the updated evaluation are similar to those presented in the WM PEIS and the WIPP SEIS-II, and would not change conclusions or DOE-wide waste management decisions based on those studies. The HSW EIS estimates that up to 33,900 shipments of LLW, MLLW, and TRU waste could be shipped to Hanford if the upper bound waste volumes are realized. The actual number of shipments is expected to be less than this.

Discussion of pending legal issues is not within the scope of this EIS.